



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

No. 32

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARDY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 25, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CRESENT HARDY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BRING A CLEAN DHS BILL TO THE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a question: Should America be brought to the brink of her own security and safety? With that question, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans and the Speaker, to put on the floor of the House the full funding of the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of beginning my tenure on this com-

mittee in the aftermath of the tragedy on 9/11. Some of us who served at that time were able to go to the site after 9/11. We were able to go soon enough to see some of those who were in the midst of recovering, since the first responders of New York refused to leave anyone behind.

It was a devastating and emotional time, but the resilience of that time also reflected America's values. I remember very strongly standing on the steps of the House, Republicans and Democrats, singing the song "God Bless America."

What we have come to today is that we are frivolously using these political tactics of taking political security over national security and rejecting our responsibility of ensuring that the men and women who are on the front lines for the security of this Nation can continue their jobs.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a court order that has temporarily issued an injunction. That court in Texas did not in any way assess the constitutionality of the President's executive actions. Why? Because he has the authority. His comments that have been repeated over and over again about his lack of authority were, yes, he does not have the authority to convey an immigration status. His executive actions are not on immigration status. They are simply keeping families from being torn apart and mothers and fathers and children from being deported. It is not an immigration status. It is a stay of deportation.

And so the fuss that is being made impacts the TSA officer tragically shot in a Los Angeles airport, or New York or Houston or Dallas or Chicago or Raleigh-Durham; that TSA officer who stands on the front lines of our security and we look them in the eye and tell them they cannot be paid. You know, Mr. Speaker, when the shutdown happened before, it was Democrats who had to retroactively ensure that those workers were paid.

We want border security? We won't be paying our Border Patrol agents or ICE agents. Even though it is suggested that fees will take care of it, there are 30,000 employees that the fees will not take care of.

So I rise today pleading to have my friends acknowledge that, first of all, they are wrong on the executive actions. As we go to a hearing in Judiciary, I will be able to show that these individuals will probably be vetted more extensively than many others in the immigration process. Fourteen provisions have to be utilized before they can be eligible for the executive action the President has suggested.

But what I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, as I started by saying, is that we are bringing America to the brink. In the midst of my comments, I indicated that I remember how we came together in the tragedy of 9/11. Well, we have a tragedy right now. We have a raging ISIS and ISIL, we have an unknown terrorist threat, and we know that the United States, although strong, stands, as the rest of the world does, needing to be prepared for those who want to be individualized, franchised terrorists.

I take my responsibility seriously. I believe in the Constitution. I even believe in language that indicates, as we say often in the Declaration of Independence, that we all are created equal, and language in the Constitution that says we have come to form a more perfect Union.

This is not perfect, and this can be remedied. I ask the Speaker to put this bill on the floor of the House in the name of firefighters and police officers and ICE officers and grants going to cities for using their best tactics; fusion centers that deal with terrorism—in their name, and many others, like Border Patrol; ICE, as I indicated; the Secret Service, as I indicated; TSA agents; parts of FAA; and FEMA, when the North is freezing and needs that kind of assistance.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1119

In the name of the people of the United States of America, how much pleading do I need to do? As a member of the Homeland Security Committee believing in those innocent families who have come here to do nothing more than to work on behalf of their families and desire to be united, on behalf of the mothers and fathers, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Speaker put on the floor of the House a clean DHS bill so that we can vote now, now, now.

SERVING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans Affairs Office of the Inspector General issued a report last Wednesday on their investigation into the nearly 14,000 veteran benefits claims that were found in a filing cabinet in Oakland, California.

Last year, these claims were brought to our attention by VA staff members, who have known about these claims for many years—despite their best efforts to raise awareness of the injustice in how these claims were being handled.

In July 2014, the former Deputy Under Secretary of the VA for Field Operations testified before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that the 14,000 claims that were found in a file cabinet had been brokered so that they would receive attention by the VA's highest performing offices.

Just 2 weeks prior to that on a site visit to the Oakland VA, the regional and division management told me that these 14,000 claims basically never existed. As a matter of fact, they claim it was a story made up by disgruntled employees.

The VA's Office of Inspector General's investigation confirmed the discovery of 14,000 claims in a filing cabinet, confirmed that some of these claims dated back to the 1990s, confirmed that thousands of these claims had not been processed, and confirmed that the staff at the Oakland VA had not been directed to properly store these claims.

Oakland VA's management claimed after my visit that they then had discovered 13,184 veteran benefit claims and 2,155 claims which required action or review. But during an onsite review, the Office of Inspector General could not confirm the existence of these claims due to the Oakland VA management's "poor recordkeeping practices."

How was the Oakland VA able to arrive at such exact numbers without maintaining records that allowed the OIG to verify the existence of these claims? It just doesn't make sense, and we have to get to the bottom of these numbers. The VA is required by law to respond to every initial claim they receive, to safeguard Federal records, and to protect private information of the veterans they work with.

When the Oakland VA managers discovered that 2,155 claims were more than several years old and required action or review, a special projects team was formed to complete this urgent task. Members of this team have told my staff that many of those claims belonged to veterans who had passed away while waiting for benefits to be processed and that their families were never contacted.

Inexplicably, the Office of Inspector General later discovered that 537 initial claims that had been marked by this special team as processed were never actually processed. Some of these claims were as old as June 2002, yet another troubling instance of the Oakland VA managers failing to provide the type of service northern California's veterans deserve.

The VA Office of Inspector General viewed only 34 of these unprocessed claims, though for some reason they declined to select a random sample. Instead, the 34 claims were selected "judiciously," which didn't make any sense. Of the 34 claims that were reviewed by the Inspector General's office, seven still remain unprocessed. In fact, though, these claims had been reviewed several times from December 2012 to June 2014 without any action being taken. In one instance, a veteran with PTSD was underpaid almost \$3,000 because his initial claim was not processed correctly.

This type of dysfunction and complete lack of oversight and accountability cannot continue in Oakland or at any VA regional offices across the country.

Sadly, this report sheds very little light on who should be accountable for these failures and is incomplete.

I am grateful the report was done and that the inspector general did delve into this issue at Oakland and many other offices, but the fact that no real conclusions were made on who is to be held accountable means much work remains to be done. We must continue to search for these answers and work to make sure the VA regional offices are properly serving our veterans.

I am also grateful, on the positive, for the many staff members of the VA—many, former veterans themselves—who care about this. They process many of these claims and make sure veterans are served. But we see there are a lot of holes in the system, obviously, that are making many veterans not have the confidence that they are going to be served, that they are going to get their claims processed, or indeed get health care if they need it later.

Indeed, the tragedy we have is that anywhere from 12 to 22 veterans give up each day in this country and commit suicide. Because they have no hope left of having the promise kept to them shows that we have much to do.

So I am grateful for those VA staffers that come to us blowing the whistle on what is wrong with the system when they can't get help from their manage-

ment to make things right. We ask them to please keep coming forward.

Contact my office, contact my staff on what needs to be done to get the word out to help make this right, because we want the VA to function well. We want the employees to feel like they are part of a system that is serving veterans and to have a good relationship within their office, but also to ultimately serve what we need as taxpayers and Americans that revere our veterans.

PASS A DHS FUNDING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I stand here this morning as a member of the Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Homeland Security. Our subcommittee is responsible for setting and overseeing funding for the operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

In 2 days, on February 27, astoundingly, funding for the Department of Homeland Security runs out because the Republican majority can't agree on a bill due to their internal disagreements on the immigration provisions which are contained in the same bill because it is in the same Department.

Although a clean funding bill, H.R. 861, could quickly be brought to this House floor for a vote to fund the entire Department for the remainder of this fiscal year, Republicans have defaulted to the rightwing extremists in their own party and instead have chosen to hold the security of our Nation hostage in order to contort the legislative process.

They would defund the President's immigration executive order merely because they want a partisan win more than they want to govern. What a tragedy.

□ 1015

To quote an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post: "The fervor of Republican partisanship, especially in the House, is immune to logic beyond an insistence on victory at any cost."

This is a Republican Party that just a year and a half ago shut our Nation's government down for 16 days, stopping critical services and doing significant harm to the U.S. economy; then, too, they seemed more interested in a political win than responsible governance.

Recall, their party also had the opportunity last Congress to bring a bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill to the floor for a vote but declined to act. They have chosen not to address a concern that an overwhelming number of Americans believe needs to be resolved.

There are grave consequences for forcing the Department of Homeland Security into a shutdown. The Republican Congress would cripple the Federal Emergency Management Agency's preparations for future disasters as

more than a fifth of personnel are furloughed.

The Republican Congress would end the Federal Emergency Management Agency's training activities with local law enforcement for weapons of mass destruction.

The Republican Congress would cut off pay to thousands of Department of Homeland Security employees who are personally tasked with protecting our homeland.

The Republican Congress would stop research and development work on countermeasures to protect us against devastating biological threats, on nuclear detection equipment, and on cargo and passenger screening technologies.

The Republican Congress would shutter the Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, meaning there will be no alerts or coordination efforts with local law enforcement agencies if a nuclear event occurs.

This is so utterly irresponsible. In an era of amplified global threats, brutal terrorist attacks throughout Europe, and escalating tension throughout the Middle East, to cut off funding for the Department tasked with ensuring our homeland security is safe and secure is truly dangerous.

This sort of behavior throws sand into the gears of a great society, of a great country, the oldest Republic on the face of the Earth. The American people surely are looking for reassurance that their government will offer them the security and dependability they expect.

We have a responsibility to protect their security, even if it means we no longer can indulge in political brinksmanship.

Mr. Speaker, we have a working bipartisan majority here in this House that holds the power to govern this Nation. All it needs is the will.

Let's bring the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill to the floor today. Let's stop playing political games with the safety and security of the American people.

We owe it to them to govern and to do the job we were elected to do.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 17 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Tierian Cash, National Chaplain for the American Legion,

Longs, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, in whose name we trust and pray, it is fitting to pause, if but momentarily, to recognize You, the One in whom does finally reside all authority and power and by whose grace we are allowed to exercise that which You have committed to us.

Accept our homage, O Lord, and hear us when we pray for wisdom to lead with integrity, compassion, and conviction.

We are mindful that around the world today our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsmen are standing the watch to safeguard our peace and liberty.

Grant to all who serve and their families Your blessings.

Accept, O Lord, these prayers, and may we perceive and know what things to do and receive grace and power to fulfill what is expected of us. We commit our best efforts and our Nation to Your keeping.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND TIERIAN "RANDY" CASH

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, please join me in welcoming to the House of

Representatives today our guest chaplain, my constituent and fellow resident of Lincoln County, North Carolina, Reverend Randy Cash.

A native North Carolinian, Reverend Cash was commissioned as a Navy chaplain in 1980. During his 26 years of Active Duty, Reverend Cash has done tours supporting both the Navy and Marines with time in Liberia, the Congo, and Albania and supporting Operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and, most recently, Operation Enduring Freedom.

Additionally, Reverend Cash has served as deputy chaplain to the U.S. Marine Corps and multiple roles for the Naval Chaplaincy School, including commanding officer.

Reverend Cash is visiting Washington this week for the 55th annual conference of the American Legion, for which he currently serves as national chaplain for that fine organization.

Please join me in welcoming Reverend Cash to the House of Representatives, and thank him for his years of dedicated service to our Nation, our Nation's men and women in the military, and our veterans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

EDUCATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I believe in an opportunity society where hard work, education, innovation, and risk are rewarded and we empower individuals, not government.

Unfortunately, Washington's broken reflex these days is: when in doubt, regulate. That type of thinking must cease if we are to reach this Nation's full potential. One of the clearest examples of unnecessary and unsuccessful Federal intervention is the law currently governing our K-12 education system.

This week, the House will consider the Student Success Act, which empowers the people closest to students with the authority to make education choices in their respective States and communities.

Local control always delivers programs and services more efficiently and effectively. By scaling back Washington's one-size-fits-all micromanagement of classrooms, this legislation takes positive steps toward ensuring local educators have the flexibility required to meet the diverse needs of their students.

FUNDING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security is charged with safeguarding our Nation from acts of terrorism, drug trafficking, and many other serious threats.

Whether they serve in the Coast Guard, Border Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, or elsewhere, the men and women who work for the Department of Homeland Security in my home State of New Hampshire and across this country play a vital role in keeping our families safe; yet Congress is poised to shut down DHS this Friday for partisan political reasons.

This would undermine our security and impact hardworking men and women from across my district, like Darrell, from Groveton, New Hampshire, who serves in the Coast Guard, and Lee, another Granite Stater, who works for Customs and Border Protection. She wrote to me recently and said: "No one wins if this political standoff continues."

I agree. We were elected to work together in the best interest of those we represent, not to play partisan political games.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department of Homeland Security open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

FEDERAL TEXAS JUDGE IMMIGRATION RULING

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my constituents and a majority of Americans oppose President Obama's executive amnesty. His amnesty is unconstitutional, which is why I am pleased that U.S. district court Judge Andrew Hanen has blocked Obama's amnesty from going into effect. Not surprisingly, the administration is now appealing.

As the legal process works its way through the courts, Congress must continue to stand strong and fight the President's unlawful amnesty. Just this month, I exposed Obama's empty words that illegals getting amnesty would be paying taxes. The IRS Commissioner confirmed that Obama's amnesty will, in fact, allow the IRS to give illegals thousands of dollars.

These tax refunds aren't refunds in the usual sense but amnesty checks from the IRS. This is wrong. I am

working on legislation to stop it. Law-abiding and hardworking American taxpayers deserve nothing less.

COUNTING DOWN TO GOP SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are playing politics with the security of the American people, and the American people deserve better.

What was absolutely laughable a few days ago, it now appears that they are prepared to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. They won't budge, even though they have known all along that the House version of the bill will never pass the Senate, and if it did, the President would surely veto it, as he should.

They are willing to burden this entire country with all the dangers and disruptions that a funding lapse would bring. They are willing to shut down funding for the security in the New York City rail system, communications equipment in Los Angeles, bomb-sniffing dogs in Massachusetts, and firefighter positions across this Nation, just so that they can put on another hollow, pointless political show.

This legislation is failure by design. I find it scandalous that the Islamic terrorists are fully funded; yet the Department of Homeland Security that protects our citizens may not be.

I urge a vote on a clean Homeland Security bill for the protection of our citizens.

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS TO CHANGE COURSE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the Presidents' Day break, I served on a delegation meeting with the leaders of Afghanistan, Jordan, and Iraq. Each was grateful for the support given in their fight against terrorists who seek mass murder of innocent civilians.

Daesh, the Arab translation of ISIL, has spread as a cancer across the region and threatens to attack the American people. President Obama's failing policies are weakening defense, and he needs to change course, as he did with the 2009 Afghan surge.

In Syria, the President's strategy has set the stage for Daesh to expand. In Iraq, his failure to achieve a status of forces agreement has led to instability. The attack on Libya has led to a failed state. The pitiful negotiations with Iran puts America at risk. His claimed success in Yemen has proven inaccurate.

Radical Islamists have declared war on the West, intend to exterminate Jews, and seek to destroy modern

democratic civilizations. The first mass slaughters have been of fellow Muslims at mosques, at soft targets, but safe havens anywhere are a threat to American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

THREE DAYS UNTIL THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, there are only 3 days left until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, forcing thousands of TSA, Customs, Border Patrol, and Secret Service agents to put their lives on the line to protect American citizens without being paid.

This has gone on far too far. We have taken weeks of time on the floor of this House, waiting for what we know ultimately would be passed, and that is a clean Homeland Security bill.

Every Democrat has cosponsored legislation to fully fund this Department, without trying to overreach and get through the appropriations process that which the majority is unwilling to do legislatively.

If you were so interested in immigration policy, the majority would long ago have brought comprehensive immigration reform to the floor of the House. Have we seen that? No—neither have we seen any legislation that the American people are really looking for, legislation that would put America back to work, build new infrastructure, and create jobs in this country.

This has gone on far too far. We have got to get this essential function of government fully funded and get back to the business that the American people sent us to.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its essential mission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

PRESIDENT OBAMA VETOES KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, despite overwhelming bipartisan support from my colleagues in both the House and the Senate, the President vetoed the Keystone XL pipeline project in the name of political expediency; rather than listening to a majority of the American public, the President's veto kowtows to a

vocal minority of extreme environmental groups.

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision yesterday is a giant leap backwards on a road to energy independence, effectively saying "no" to the creation of over 40,000 American jobs and lower energy prices for businesses and families.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama had the opportunity to stand up and show true leadership, but unfortunately, he chose to, once again, hide behind political motives.

□ 1215

ECONOMIC GROWTH FOR NEVADA

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, just this morning, Nevada Attorney General Laxalt testified before the House Judiciary Committee, claiming that the implementation of DAPA and extension of DACA would cause undue economic hardship for our State. Well, I would like to see his evidence, because data show that granting administrative relief to qualified undocumented immigrants would actually contribute to economic growth.

Thanks to these executive actions, the legal workforce will expand, and average wages for all workers will increase by \$170 a year. The Federal deficit will be reduced by \$25 billion, and GDP will grow from \$90 billion to \$210 billion over the next decade. Furthermore, it is estimated that expanding DACA and DAPA will increase Nevada's GDP from \$700 million to \$1.7 billion over the next 10 years and lead to \$21 million in additional tax revenue for the State over the next 5 years.

So, in short, General, not implementing the President's actions is not only morally indefensible, but also economically foolish. And, I might add, holding up DHS funding for this purpose is a shameful political act that puts Americans at risk.

M-855 AMMO BAN

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for the rights of law-abiding Americans to protect their homes, and I am standing in opposition to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' unreasonable proposal to ban entire classes of ammunition.

As an American, I personally use this ammunition to defend my home and my family, and that is my constitutional right. I find it ironic that the President of the United States continues to say, well, if we would just arm the people of other countries, then ISIS wouldn't exist, while he uses each and every means possible to violate our Second Amendment right to protect ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to set the record straight, and I look forward to meeting with the ATF and discussing their budget and making sure that they don't have the legal authority or the funding to take away Americans' constitutional rights to keep and bear arms and ammo.

DHS SHUTDOWN

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, in 3 days, the Department of Homeland Security will needlessly run out of funding—yes, 3 days. Shutting down the Department of Homeland Security will jeopardize local disaster relief grants. It will stall critical safety training for firefighters and first responders and will force thousands of Border Patrol agents, Active Duty Coast Guard servicemembers, and airport security screeners across the country to work without pay.

House Republicans are threatening the safety and security of our Nation and our families by refusing to pass a clean security funding bill, instead, pushing for anti-immigration amendments. This is unwise, this is unnecessary, and this is wrong. We should not play partisan politics when our Nation's security is on the line.

We must pass a funding bill that does not include harmful provisions, so that our Nation remains safe and secure. That is why I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

STRENGTHENING TAX-FREE 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 529, a bill I have co-sponsored that strengthens tax-free 529 college savings accounts. The cost of higher ed has increased by more than 500 percent since 1985, yet the President recently proposed a tax hike on 529 savings of students and middle class families.

There is a big difference between being able to afford college and being able to pay for it. The 529s help bridge that gap for millions of working Americans who make too little to cover tuition but just enough to be ineligible for financial aid.

Our Nation's long-term prosperity depends on our ability to prepare the next generation for success. Let's start now by passing H.R. 529.

DHS SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand that a clean, straightforward Department of Homeland Security funding bill be brought to the House floor for a vote immediately. After today, there are only 2 more days until the entire Department of Homeland Security is shut down, 2 days until the men and women who work to protect our national security stop receiving a paycheck, 2 days until the doors are shut at the Department responsible for ensuring America's safety.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to debate the merits of immigration reform, then bring an immigration bill to the floor. We would welcome that debate. We are ready to work on a comprehensive bill to fix a broken system. In the meantime, don't play games with our national security.

Again, I urge the House leadership to bring a clean funding bill. It is H.R. 861. We need to keep the Department of Homeland Security open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe, and we need to be able to move forward to work on the pressing matters facing our country.

DHS SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect us to deliver solutions and to fix problems; they expect us to act responsibly and govern. We can do this by working together and averting a shutdown at the Department of Homeland Security.

Let me be clear: shutting down the Department of Homeland Security should not be an option, and I am adamantly opposed to letting this happen.

Our first and foremost responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to protect our Nation. Ever since the attacks of September 11, 2001, the need for the Department of Homeland Security became clear, and the Department of Homeland Security has proven vital to keeping the American people safe amid an ongoing war against terror.

Terror threats do not just go away until Washington is able to come to a compromise. There is certainly broad disagreement, Mr. Speaker, in this country over the President's executive actions. By shutting down DHS, it only makes us more vulnerable to attacks. It is absolutely the wrong approach to addressing this disagreement. There is no room for political brinkmanship when the security of the American public is at stake.

SELMA VOTING RIGHTS

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of the voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery and to urge my colleagues to pass voting rights legislation in this Congress.

In 1960, there were only 66,000 African Americans registered to vote in Alabama. In 1965, there were 15,000 Black residents of Dallas County, Alabama, where Selma is located, but fewer than 200 were registered to vote. African Americans who attempted to vote faced intimidation, discrimination, and worse.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the unrelenting efforts of heroes like our colleague from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, helped correct these injustices. But the fight isn't over. State legislation, ballot initiatives, and court cases across the country in recent years have jeopardized the voter registration protections that JOHN LEWIS and others fought so hard for.

We need to stay vigilant, and we need new legislation today. As we celebrate Black History Month, let's recognize how far we have come. Let's pass voting rights legislation in this Congress for the good of the country.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE VETO

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, for more than 6 years, the President has called for taxpayer-funded infrastructure projects. In the first year of his administration, he squandered nearly \$1 trillion on so-called shovel-ready projects that he later joked weren't shovel ready at all. Mr. Speaker, \$1 trillion is \$8,000 taken from every family in America, on average. That is what we spent. That is what he joked about when it turned out we got very little for it.

Now along comes the Keystone pipeline. It promises \$8 billion of private investment at no cost to taxpayers. That major infrastructure project would have produced 42,000 construction-related jobs and, when finished, more than a half million barrels a day of Canadian crude oil entering the American economy. That is what he vetoed after it was sent to him with bipartisan votes out of both Houses.

He calls this middle class economics. The reality is it is a war on the middle class. And that is no joke.

DHS SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the imminent danger our country faces in 3 days. Right now, Republicans have decided that it is more important to listen to the Tea

Party and their extremist views rather than funding the Department of Homeland Security.

And I don't want to hear this mess from Republicans about, oh, the workers are still going to get paid. Let me tell you something. We are talking about 250,000 essential employees that could go without pay—that are airport screeners and are doing important things like keeping us safe—and sending them to work without pay, where they don't know how they are going to make their car note; they don't know if they are going to be able to pay their mortgage or bring groceries home. That is putting America in danger.

We need to keep Homeland Security open. We need to stop playing this reckless game that the Republicans are putting us through because it is the duty of Congress to keep American families safe and govern responsibly.

Republicans need to realize that the only path through this is having us do a clean DHS bill. It is time for Republicans to join the 192 House Democrats that have already signed up. We need to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

ISIS

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the last several months, Islamic State has shown just how barbaric they can be. They are willing to kill and torture innocent people in the most savage ways to intimidate the United States and the civilized world. With the recent beheadings in the Middle East and the multiple shootings in Europe, it is very clear that terrorism is a problem that only continues to grow.

Islamic State might be the most well-trained, well-equipped, and well-financed terror group we have seen; and if an international coalition is not willing to stop them, no one will.

I have supported President Obama's use of airstrikes since they began several months ago to push back on Islamic State, and I still strongly believe that we should continue these strikes with our Arab partners.

Throughout our history, we have shown that we can overcome any obstacle and defeat any enemy if we are willing to stand up to it.

However, I have so far been disappointed that the President has asked for an Authorization for Use of Military Force without articulating a clear strategy on how to ultimately defeat

the enemy. If President Obama would present such a plan, I believe both Republicans and Democrats in both Chambers would stand with him and show the world that we are united in confronting this dangerous enemy.

I hope the President takes this opportunity to lead and unite the American people toward defeating our latest adversary in the war on terror.

DHS SHUTDOWN

(Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are only 3 days until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, forcing more than 50,000 TSA airport security screeners and tens of thousands of Customs and Border Protection officers to work without pay. Many of these dedicated public servants work at Los Angeles International Airport, LAX, which is in my congressional district. They screen the passengers and examine the cargo to keep the airports secure.

LAX is the sixth busiest airport in the world and third busiest in the United States. In 2013, LAX served more than 66 million passengers and processed more than 1.9 million tons of cargo with a value of over \$91.6 billion.

The security of LAX is critical for the people of Los Angeles and the entire country, and the public servants who work hard every day to keep our airports safe deserve to be paid for the work that they do. Let's fund DHS now.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1230

CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, today, as we consider many issues surrounding the education of our Nation's youth, I rise to draw attention to the importance of career technical education. Having raised five kids, I understand how access to quality learning is critical to ensuring that every child has an opportunity to achieve their potential.

That is why I have worked to support career and technical education and teach students the relevant skills they need to get a good-paying job. Often referred to as vocational, or voc-ed, CTE

courses frequently offer on-the-job training that translates into employment right after graduation. That means more opportunities for students and less debt.

I was proud to learn that Cheboygan Area High School in my congressional district was named one of the top schools in northern Michigan in CTE, an achievement for which Cheboygan Area Schools should be justifiably proud. It is my hope that students in northern Michigan and all over the United States will take advantage of quality CTE programs to further their careers and continue to grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to supporting measures that help to return control of education to States and parents, allowing families to choose an educational program that fits their needs.

CELEBRATING WEST COAST PORTS AND ILWU, PMA DEAL

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I, along with the rest of the country, am breathing a sigh of relief that full-time work has resumed at our west coast ports. I wanted to publicly thank the ILWU and the PMA for staying at the table and finally reaching an agreement. I want to thank President Obama and our Labor Secretary Perez for their help in bringing about a resolution.

Many of my colleagues here in Congress were calling me daily for updates because the workers, the farmers, the businesses, and the consumers in their districts were also impacted by what happens on the west coast ports.

I represent the men and women who work on those ports, so our economy in the harbor area was greatly affected, but we also realize that these ports are an economic engine for the entire country. Our west coast ports support millions of American jobs and provide a vital link to global commerce. So today I am going to testify before the Budget Committee to remind Congress that we should fully fund all the ports in this country because they are such an important link to our economy.

NET NEUTRALITY

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, we have quite a variety of issues that we are talking about today. Whether it is the President's executive amnesty and overreach, the overreach of the DHS, or the veto of the Keystone pipeline, people are concerned about what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn our attention to another issue: the takeover of the Internet by the Federal Commu-

nications Commission. We just completed a hearing at the Energy and Commerce Committee on this issue. I tell you there is great concern about what the FCC would do with the Internet.

The Internet is not broken, and it does not need the Federal Government to fix it. So people are rightfully concerned about that. The FCC, in taking control of the Internet, would do a couple of things. First of all, it would be a loss of some of our freedoms because the FCC would reclassify the Internet to title II. Now, title II of the Communications Act is the 1930s-era law that regulates telephones and telecommunications. It would thereby subject the Internet, which is an information service, to a host of taxes, regulation, and international consideration. This is not the direction we want to go with the Internet. Let's not use 1930s-era laws on an information service. Let's make certain that the FCC delays their net neutrality order and that we work together to keep the Internet open and free.

DHS SHUTDOWN

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, as I stand before this body today, it is with a tremendous amount of concern for the brave men and women who are protecting our country and work for the Department of Homeland Security. We are only about 48 hours or so away from a potential shutdown, and I am concerned about these people, who are going to have to continue to work because they are dedicated, loyal, and patriotic Americans but won't be getting paid if we allow this government to shut down.

Now, all we have to do in this House of Representatives is to bring up a clean Homeland Security funding bill. That is all we have to do. The Senate majority leader said he would do that. So we can get this problem solved right away.

This situation is being handled in the courts, and this body of ours, this House of Representatives, is no place to try to work out some sort of ideological partisan divide around immigration. This is an occasion for us to look out after the safety and security of the American people and to fund and pay the salaries of the workers who guarantee that security, not a time for partisan ideological chicanery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry on its mission of keeping the American people safe.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

THE IRS' PUTATIVE LACK OF FUNDS FOR TAX FORMS AND INSTRUCTION BOOKLETS

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on an issue that many constituents brought to my attention. Tax Day is right around the corner, and as many folks prepare to file their taxes, they are having issues locating the proper forms.

The IRS has notified local libraries—and even congressional offices like mine—that it does not have the money to distribute enough tax forms and instruction booklets so that taxpayers can file their returns accurately and on time. As a result, Mr. Speaker, seniors and those without access to the Internet are scrambling to find 1040 instruction booklets and tax schedules they need to accurately file their taxes. My office distributed nearly 40 tax instruction books and tax forms during a recent community office hours event in Lebanon County, and the demand continues to grow daily.

Mr. Speaker, the IRS' claim that they can no longer afford to send tax forms to local libraries due to budget cuts is disingenuous. And while needing more than 40 pages of instructions to complete the least complicated tax return is proof enough for simplifying the Tax Code, it is no excuse for the IRS to make paying your Federal taxes an even bigger headache by making it more difficult for my constituents to get the documents they need. Let's get our tax forms where they are needed.

THE CONCERNS OF OUR DISTRICTS

(Mr. HASTINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges we have here in the House of Representatives is to speak to any issue during this period of time.

Regrettably, I rise today to speak of the death of an iconic figure, a dynamic force for social justice, Georgia Jones Ayers, who was not from my congressional district but from Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON's district, and I am sure that the two of us will add additional remarks.

I also happily today come to the floor to congratulate the Dillard High School girls basketball team and the Palm Beach Lakes High School basketball teams. Dillard and Coach Pinder, my dear friend, have had such a consecutive run that they are becoming a real force nationally as well as locally, and Palm Beach County took theirs as well. So I am fortunate that I have girls basketball teams that are champions, and I proudly congratulate them.

CADILLAC TAX

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the estimated 12 million Americans in the middle class who are paying more than \$1,000 extra per year because of the excise tax on health care plans included in the ObamaCare legislation called the Cadillac tax. This legislation is set to take effect in 2018; however, employers, labor unions, and municipalities all back home are already preparing for this devastating tax.

In order to comply with this 40 percent penalty on health care plans, Mr. Speaker, employers and municipalities are looking at increasing deductibles, reducing benefits, and shifting costs to consumers as well as property taxpayers. In fact, in Manchester, our State's largest city, an anticipated cost of 5 to \$6 million alone will impact the property taxpayers. This will undoubtedly result in an increase in our local property taxes, which, as every Granite Stater knows, are already sky high.

Mr. Speaker, Americans simply can't afford this tax, which is why I introduced a repeal bill. I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats to get this bill passed.

HONORING SISTER CLARE CARTY

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great leader and visionary in my community, Sister Clare Carty, who passed away on Saturday, February 14, at the age of 78. Sister Clare was born in Philadelphia and entered the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia in 1955, beginning her career as an elementary school teacher. In 1980, she joined the St. Mary Medical Center system as an assistant administrator, where I happened to be working as a hospital pharmacy clerk. I will never forget her kind interaction with her staff. Nobody was more proud of the colleagues, physicians, and volunteers at St. Mary's than Sister Clare.

In 1982, Sister Clare rose to the rank of president and CEO at St. Mary. Her persistence and leadership led to the development of one of the first community hospital open heart surgery programs in the area, as well as the establishment of the only trauma center in my home community of the County of Bucks.

After two decades of work, Sister Clare left St. Mary to serve in the development of Home Health Services for Catholic Health East, and once she retired from health care administration, she devoted her time to the Sisters of St. Francis. Sister Clare was instru-

mental in establishing the Mother Bachmann Maternity Center, Children's Health Center, Family Resource Center, and Bucks County Health Improvement Project.

Mr. Speaker, you won't meet many people with the compassion, character, and very capable leadership of Sister Clare. She touched and improved not just the medical center but our entire community. I celebrate her life and her legacy, her faithful example, and her leadership. We are certainly grateful to know Sister Clare, and I am thankful for everything she did for the people of Pennsylvania and all those that she served.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 529, SECTION 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS AMENDMENTS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 121 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 121

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 529) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of March 2, 2015, relating to a measure making or con-

tinuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of March 1, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot going on in this rule today, a lot to be proud of.

I would like to start by thanking the folks on the Parliamentarian staff and Mr. Steve Cote on the Rules Committee. Folks don't pay a lot of attention to what goes on down here sometimes, what goes on behind the scenes, in order to bring a bill to the floor. We did a little extra work this time around. I am grateful to folks for working with me to get that done.

House Resolution 121 is a closed rule, but it makes in order the consideration of two bills. One is H.R. 529, a bill that passed by unanimous consent out of the Ways and Means Committee, that goes into these college savings plans and corrects some provisions that made it difficult for folks to redeposit money into those plans—again, all about trying to educate our children, to make sure they have the opportunities that we would want for them.

The second provision made in order by this rule is the general debate of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act. Folks may not know the Student Success Act yet, Mr. Speaker, though they will. It will become as normalized of a term as No Child Left Behind.

That was the last time we reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe we will find much disagreement in this Chamber about the need to go back into that language now, 13 years later, and make some improvements in order to better serve our children.

We might disagree about what those improvements are, but we know it is time to go back and get into that language and really try to make a difference for those families, students,

and schools back home. H.R. 5 intends to do just that.

This rule also provides suspension authority for any time through March 1 to bring up a resolution that either makes appropriations for or continues appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security.

You heard a lot about it during the 1 minutes this morning, Mr. Speaker. What we have is Department of Homeland Security funding which, as you know, funds so much of the immigration services function of our government.

As you know, a Federal judge has said that the plans the President has laid out cannot be completed lawfully. This House went forward and said: If it can't do those things lawfully, we are certainly not going to fund them in this bill.

Now, the Senate has not even been able to bring that bill up for debate, blocked on the Senate side from any discussion whatsoever.

We are going to hopefully find a resolution between now and the end of this week. I don't know when that resolution is going to come. When that resolution comes, I don't want to see this House delayed in bringing that resolution to the floor. Again, we have already done our work. My hope is the Senate can pass that bill, and we can go ahead and send it directly to the President's desk.

Whatever those machinations may need to be, this rule makes bringing an additional provision in order as soon as that language becomes available. That is maximum flexibility to do what I think folks on both sides of this Chamber want to do, and that is to ensure the steady, continuous, deliberate functioning of this government.

Mr. Speaker, No Child Left Behind, it was passed by a Republican House and a Republican Senate and sent to a Republican President for his signature. Today, that same Republican House is bringing forward a rewrite of that bill.

As much as we all have a love and affection for children, as much as we want public education in this country to succeed, sometimes, we don't get it right.

Again, I want to celebrate the bipartisanship in that. It is not everybody just looking to find somebody to blame. I think folks went into that process trying to do the very best that they could; but, in fact, we ended up with some top-down solutions that did not serve our districts as well as we would have hoped.

I am very fortunate, Mr. Speaker. I come from a district with wonderful public schools, just wonderful public schools. In fact, we are the fastest growing congressional district in the State of Georgia.

It is not because of any particular strong business presence, though we have a tremendously strong business presence. It is not because of our location in some pleasant area, though it is a particularly pleasant area. It is be-

cause our school systems are second to none.

It is hard when we have to have these conversations about funding for local schools because the money that I spend on these children is money that I am borrowing from these children.

It has to be an investment in these children. It has to be something that enables them to succeed even more tomorrow than they are today because I am borrowing it from their future. I am mortgaging their future in order to invest in them today. We all want those dollars to be used as well as they can.

It would be easy to have a conversation about funding children to say: Well, if \$1 is good, then \$2 must be better, and if \$2 is good, then \$4 must be better, and if \$4 is good, then \$1 million must be better, and if \$1 million is good, then \$1 trillion must be better.

I would dispute the attestation of any colleague who can find that direct correlation between dollars and performance. Dollars are critically important, and this bill provides those, but performance is tied to parents, it is tied to teachers, it is tied to principals, it is tied to communities. We cannot mandate that performance. We can only try to help those local folks succeed.

I know a lot of my colleagues are concerned that unless we mandate a solution from Washington, we will allow local communities to fail. I know that concern is heartfelt. I don't come from one of those communities.

The community I come from says: Washington is not getting it so right, but, trust us, we will take care of children down here because no one in Washington loves our children more than we do.

Again, we see that.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that children are going to succeed in this country, but there is an achievement gap. There is a gap, Mr. Speaker, depending on what your ZIP code is, between what success we expect to come from your family and what success you can actually attain.

I come from a county, Mr. Speaker, that is widely diverse, that has all the economic challenges you can imagine and all the economic successes that you can imagine as well. We come together to make sure that no child is left behind and to make sure that no child is held back.

We have both schools that are succeeding in ways that I could stand on this floor and brag about for hours, taking students from which the system expects so little and creating an opportunity for them to succeed so extraordinarily. I would like to see that replicated in school districts across the Nation. I see it back home in my school.

But we also have the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, GSMST. U.S. News & World Report names it the third best high school in the United States of

America. I, of course, think U.S. News & World Report got it wrong. We are the absolute best high school in the United States of America.

A majority of that student body, Mr. Speaker, are minority students. A majority of that student body had an opportunity to go anywhere in the county they wanted to go, but they stood in line, hoping to win the lottery to get out of a school that was already performing well to get into this school where they could be exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, there are children standing in line across this country waiting to be exceptional. This bill aims to clear that line away and allow every child in America to achieve the excellence that you and I both know they deserve.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much at this time to be able to accommodate the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY. She was going to be scheduled to speak earlier. I am going to allow that she go forward now to discuss something that is very important, and then I will proceed with my opening, if the Speaker will allow.

There are only 3 days left until funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires, which will shut down many of the crucial operations that keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule that will allow for consideration of a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill. With such serious consequences, it is time to put politics aside and prioritize the safety and security of the American people.

To discuss that particular aspect of the proposal, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to immediately take up and pass a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Delaying the full-year bill limits the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's unity of effort initiative designed to improve coordination in our security missions; limits the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign; creates uncertainty regarding ICE's capacity to detain and deport dangerous criminals; complicates the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border stations; delays implementation of the new security upgrades at the White House and hiring increases of the U.S. Secret Service; delays terrorism preparedness, my colleagues, and response grants for State and local public safety personnel and from fusion centers.

I understand that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel quite strongly about the President's use of executive orders on immigration policy; but do they have the courage of their convictions to look the first responders they represent in the eye and to tell them that they are holding up critical assistance to firefighters, law enforcement, EMTs, and emergency managers because of a fight that is ideological over immigration?

This is disgraceful. The Homeland Security bill should never have been held hostage with only 3 days left until the Republican shutdown. Hasn't this gone on long enough? Isn't it time to abandon this failed strategy and pass a clean Homeland Security bill?

To that end, I urge this whole House to join me today in defeating the previous question so that my colleague Mr. HASTINGS can offer an amendment to provide a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I rise, obviously, in opposition to the rule and underlying bill because neither of these measures will keep the Department of Homeland Security from shutting down in 3 days, something that I am sure is of vital interest to my friend from Georgia who is an advocate, continuously and has been since being on the Rules Committee and here in Congress, of having an open process.

I would only urge that we understand that the last Congress, the 113th, was the most closed Congress in the history of all of the House of Representatives; yet, at this point, in this, the 114th Congress, we find ourselves in this position. In the last Congress, 38 percent of the rules were closed at this point, six out of 16.

As of today, this House has approved 75 percent of its rules that are closed. In other words, this Congress is on a path to be twice as closed as the last, which had the most, in history, closed rules.

Now, my friend Mr. WOODALL certainly understands that, and every Member of this House understands that. A lot of times, constituents hear us, and it sounds a whole lot like Washington speak, but the fact is, just simply, that when a rule is closed, as this one is, with the exception of one portion that is open for yet another provision in the measure, H.R. 5, but when a rule is closed, that means all of the other Members, all of your constituents who do not have an opportunity if they so choose, are precluded from offering an amendment to the base bill that is being discussed.

□ 1300

Congress has 3 days to act before we shut down; and truthfully, I don't believe that my friends on the Repub-

lican side are crazy enough to shut down the government at this point, so I think something is going to happen. I don't know what.

It is not like this debacle caught us by surprise. It was obvious way back when Congress funded the rest of the government for the year but funded DHS for only a few months. Yet each week my Republican friends continue to consider bills that will do nothing and go nowhere. And now, without a road map out of this quagmire, my Republican friends are threatening to double down on their politics by shutting down the agency responsible for our national security, yet somehow we find ourselves talking about completely unrelated measures.

You can disagree with the President—and many of you do, and sometimes some of us do. Great. It is a beautiful free country that we live in—but don't put our national security at risk to do it.

Now, I have heard my Republican colleagues' talking point—oh, no, don't worry about national security; most of the DHS employees will still work, and very little will change—but that is just a guess, because those employees will be expected to work without pay.

Among those who are expected to work without pay are more than 40,000 Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection officers, more than 50,000 TSA aviation security screeners, more than 13,000 Immigration and Customs Enforcement law enforcement agents and officers, more than 40,000 Active Duty Coast Guard military members, and more than 4,000 Secret Service law enforcement agents and officers.

Footnote right there. Very occasionally when we are talking budget matters and when we are talking authorization and appropriations, we talk about the need for certainty for the agencies that have to implement the measures that are before them. Well, that could not be truer at any point any more than with DHS needing that certainty as well.

To add insult to injury, when all this gets fixed—and it will need to be fixed—we will need to pass another measure to retroactively ensure that they receive their paychecks. But until then, there is no way for them to know when they will be paid. That kind of gamble is not the best way to ensure the stability of our national defense, and it is not fair to ask of the men and women keeping us safe.

We talk a lot about job creation here in this institution. My friends across the aisle gut clean air and water protections in the name of job creation. In the name of job creation, my friends hack away at the policies implemented to keep big banks from preying on hardworking Americans. If, by chance, DHS shuts down, approximately 30,000 employees would be furloughed. That is 30,000 families with jobs taken away.

Who knows how long a shutdown will last. We have already had months to

address this lapse in funding. Why do we do this? Why is it every time we get ready to do something important, we play brinksmanship, we come up until the day of? It is really the kind of holding up of our process that is deleterious to the good of this country.

Just because DHS employees are furloughed or not being paid but still must go to work, that doesn't mean that their mortgage payment or their car payment or any other bills are going to go away. What are they supposed to say? "Don't worry. I will pay you retroactively"? You can't run your household that way, and we certainly should not be running our government that way. For the life of me, I cannot understand why my Republican friends will not join House Democrats in supporting clean legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

So, after all that, what do these two education bills that are in this particular rule have to do with keeping DHS open? I have no idea. I consider them to be important, but they don't have anything to do with what is the most germane issue before us today, the most pertinent issue.

If the goal is to make college more affordable, there is no reason to focus on provisions used by only 3 percent of families. We need to make higher education more affordable for all Americans. Moreover, my friends have yet to explain what makes these 529 provisions so important that they are willing—listen to me carefully—to add \$51 million to the deficit for these particular measures, \$51 million added to the deficit that they talk so much about.

The other measure, H.R. 5, makes even less sense. It would have catastrophic consequences for our Nation's most vulnerable youth and their educators. I respect my colleague from Georgia immensely. I respect his intellect immensely. I am proud that his schools are doing extremely well in the community that he is privileged to serve. But I can tell you, based on what I know, that any changes to the No Child Left Behind program must adhere to the spirit of the law. In Florida, we didn't only leave children behind; we lost them and couldn't find them.

Somehow or another, we keep changing these things without having the accountability and the transparency. We cannot and we should not leave any child in America behind. Children with disabilities, English learners, families with less financial resources, and those from racial and ethnic minority groups of underserved communities all deserve quality education, and our Nation would be better for it if they all received quality education.

These two bills are distractions from the main event, side shows for the center ring of the circus. It is time for Congress to focus on the things that matter, because even as our economy grows stronger, we still have plenty of real work to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Just to be clear—we are down here talking about education today—I share my friend's passion for proper funding of this government. This House passed its funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security on January 14—January 14. This isn't something that has happened to us this week. January 14, the House did its business. The Senate has tried over and over and over to bring up a bill, and the Democrats haven't allowed them to even have the debate on the bill.

This all being said, this is a bill that refuses to fund what a Federal Court said would be illegal to do. How in the world we have been able to define the House work product that refuses to fund what the court said it would be illegal to do as somehow the wrong bill to bring to the floor is just a testimony to the messaging machine that my friends had. I wish we had more of that machine here. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back on the topic of the day, what does matter for our children back home.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of both of the bills that this rule brings to the floor: H.R. 529 and the Student Success Act. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am especially pleased that the Student Success Act is a major rewrite of the No Child Left Behind law. I was the only member from the Tennessee delegation—the 11-member delegation in the House and Senate, and I think one of 45 in the House—that voted against the original No Child Left Behind law, which was a great overreaction to failed school systems in a few of our Nation's biggest cities, and we certainly didn't need it in east Tennessee. That, much to my surprise, turned out to be one of the most popular votes I ever cast among public schoolteachers in east Tennessee.

I am here primarily today to speak in support of H.R. 529, which this rule also includes. Richard Vedder, an economist from Ohio University, wrote a few years ago a book called "Going Broke By Degree," talking about how difficult it was to pay for higher education in this country today. Around the same time, U.S. News & World Report came out with a report that said college educations were almost becoming out of reach for most middle class families. We need to be doing everything we can to help families pay for college education, and we certainly don't need to be encouraging students to go further into debt.

It shocks students at the University of Tennessee when I tell them that it cost me \$90 a quarter my first year at the University of Tennessee, \$270 for the whole year. I heard the minority, the respected minority leader, Mr. HOYER, give a speech one time. He said

his first year at the University of Maryland it cost him \$87 a semester.

But then in the mid-1960s, the Federal student loan program came in, and the colleges and universities around the country started using that as a way to tamp down any opposition to tuition or fee increases, and college tuition and fees have just gone out of sight since that time.

I have been speaking out for years about how harmful the Federal student loan program has become for college students and their families. Now many others are saying the same thing. Kathleen Parker, writing in *The Washington Post* in January of 2013, said:

Since 1985, the cost of higher education has increased 538 percent, while the consumer price index (inflation) over the same period has gone up 121 percent.

That is four-and-a-half times as much on the increases in college education.

Floyd Norris, writing in the international *New York Times* last February said: "Student loans are creating large problems that may persist for decades. They will impoverish some borrowers and serve as a drain on economic activity."

Hedge fund manager James Altucher wrote: "We are graduating a generation of indentured" students.

I can tell you, when I went to the University of Tennessee, people could work part time, as I always did, to pay all their tuition and fees. Almost no one got out of school with a debt; now, almost everyone does. Total outstanding student loan debt is now well over a trillion dollars. I think it is \$1.3 trillion, and some people think it may be one of the next bubbles to burst.

So what does H.R. 529 do? It makes it easier for families to save for college educations. We need to do this. We also need to give bigger grants and so forth to the universities and colleges that hold their tuition and fees below the rate of inflation. We need to incentivize the colleges and universities to stop raising their tuition and fees at four and five times the rate of inflation. Until we do that, H.R. 529 is the least we can do to help out the middle class families of this country that are having so much trouble paying for their students, their children to have college educations.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I support these two bills.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both of us how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), a good friend of mine, a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Florida for allowing me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5, Student Success Act.

This bill would continue unnecessary and arbitrary K-12 education funding cuts and erode accountability for historically underserved students. We should be preparing the next generation, but this bill is a step backwards in achieving academic excellence for 90 percent of the Nation's students.

Mr. Speaker, diverse organizations across not only my State, the great State of Ohio, but across this Nation, educational organizations, educational funding organizations, parents and lawyer advocacy groups, business leaders and groups, disability and exceptional children's groups, and the NAACP and civil rights organizations are against this and very concerned about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the way we fund all of our schools and educate all of our young scholars is a reflection on our values and commitment to equality.

□ 1315

Access to education is a civil right. It is the key to the middle class and to a prosperous nation. This bill would constrain educational opportunity and equality. We need an education bill that improves education and that invests in all of our children. H.R. 5 fails our children, Mr. Speaker, and H.R. 5 fails our Nation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my friend that I can feel her heart in those words. I am just tremendously proud to serve in a place where people really do care about the next generation, making sure that we are able to achieve those goals. I regret we are not finding the agreement on that today, but I am certain, as long as there are folks here who believe in achieving that goal together, as my friend does, we will get there.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be joined today by a freshman Member from the Georgia delegation, an incredibly hardworking Member.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come before you to talk about and support H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation to replace No Child Left Behind, to restore local control over education, and to empower parents and local education leaders to hold schools accountable for effectively teaching students.

I spent last week in my district, and I visited elementary and high schools, specifically schools that would be affected by the Student Success Act. These schools were located in some of the most impoverished areas of my district. I listened in classrooms, held forums to hear from parents and local education leaders, and spoke to teachers and administrators about the challenges they are facing. What I heard across the board was that the Federal Government and their compliance issues in the classroom are holding back our educators from effectively teaching our students.

Top-down education mandates have failed to help students and have forced educators to waste valuable time and resources filling out paperwork and worrying about compliance with Federal requirements. Instead of this one-size-fits-all approach, we need policies that enhance teachers' abilities to focus on the individual needs of the students. We need bottom-up reforms that give authority to the parents, teachers, and local education leaders, who work with their children and students every day and who know them best.

H.R. 5 includes a number of conservative reforms to push back against the growing reach of the Federal Government into schools and to restore local control. It replaces the current national accountability system for school performance and replaces it with State-led performance standards. It gets rid of more than 65 unnecessary or ineffective Federal education programs, repeals Federal requirements for teacher quality, and protects local and State autonomy over decisions in the classroom. H.R. 5 returns responsibility to parents, States, and local leaders to hold schools accountable instead of Washington bureaucrats.

I saw that example work in a city that is in one of the most impoverished areas of my district, where parents actually lined up at 3:30 in the morning to enroll their students into theme schools. Each elementary school was broken up into a theme. The superintendent there had no idea that parental involvement would be that significant. I was there to witness the success of this theme school concept. I asked: Where did this idea come from? It did not come from Washington. It did not come from the Federal Government. It came from the creativity of the teachers and from the input of the parents and of the local administrators.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows the needs of students better than the people who work and spend time with them every day. By empowering parents, teachers, and local education leaders, H.R. 5 takes strong steps forward in putting the control of education back in the right hands and in helping to provide every student with the opportunity to receive a good education. There is no debate today that every child deserves a good education. The debate is whether the Federal Government is in charge or whether we empower our local citizens to get the job done.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its essential mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has

been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield for the purpose of debate only. If we can pass this rule, this rule makes in order the immediate consideration with the same-day authority of any funding bills that come before this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this is pretty immediate. We need to get this done this week. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that will keep the Department open so we can keep the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understood my friend, he is asking that we bring up a bill that will fund what it is the court said would be illegal to fund. I cannot yield for that kind of request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its vital mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield back my time when my friend is. As soon as we pass this resolution, it will be in order to bring up any additional funding bills that come before the House today, but I cannot yield during this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished leader of the Democratic Caucus, for purposes as she sees fit.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that will keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), my classmate and good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my classmate and good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a new Member of Congress who is on the Oversight Committee.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 5. The legislation represents a significant backward step in the efforts to help all of our Nation's children and their families prepare for their futures.

I speak as a parent, as a grandparent, and as a past school board president. H.R. 5 abandons the historic Federal role in education at elementary and secondary levels. It is the role of ensuring the educational process of all of America's students, including students from low-income families, students with disabilities, English learners, and students of color. It also fails to maintain the core expectation that States and school districts will take serious, sustained, and targeted action, when necessary, to correct achievement gaps and to reform low-performing schools.

Additionally, H.R. 5 fails to identify opportunity gaps or to correct inequities in access to resources and supports that students need to succeed, such as challenging academic courses, excellent teachers and principals, after-school enrichment or expanded learning time, and other academic and non-academic supports.

The bill's caps on Federal education spending would lock in recent budget cuts for the rest of the decade, and the bill would allow funds currently required to be used for education to be used for other purposes, such as spending on sports stadiums or tax cuts for the wealthy.

Finally, H.R. 5 fails to make critical investments for our Nation's students, including high-quality preschool for America's children, support for America's teachers and principals, and investment in innovative solutions for the public education system.

For these reasons, I oppose H.R. 5. It would deny Federal funds to the classrooms that need them the most, and it fails to assure parents that policymakers and educators will take the action students need when they are not learning.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have not had an opportunity to meet the gentlewoman from Michigan, but because I serve on the Rules Committee, I have had an opportunity to see all of the amendments that she has submitted for this bill. I know one of those amendments that she submitted is to make sure that all of our learning plans take special note of children in foster care and to make sure those folks are not forgotten, and I am grateful to her for her attention to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Florida if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do.

Mr. WOODALL. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank the gentleman for his long service.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was created to address the enormous inequality in America's educational system, which created widespread poverty and segregation. Today, we know that we are still not educating Black and Latino students at the same level we educate White students. Fifty years after the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, educating all children, regardless of their backgrounds, is still one of the most important challenges we face as a nation.

That is why equity must start at the heart of any attempt to overhaul our education system, but the Student Success Act does little to help kids in Minnesota who are struggling in schools with too few resources. Rather than eliminating the disparities in our education system, the bill today will only increase the achievement gap and leave behind students from low-income neighborhoods and students with disabilities.

□ 1330

Education matters, far beyond the individual student. Three-fourths of the return on early education goes back to the community and ensures a healthier society and more stable economy.

One of the biggest gaps in literacy in the U.S. is between the children of college-educated and non-college-educated parents. We must be more committed to maximizing the potential of all students. Our students and teachers deserve better. I urge that we all oppose H.R. 5 so we can create education reform legislation that ensures every student can realize their goals and dreams.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am grateful to the chair for permitting me earlier to allow Mrs. LOWEY to speak to the previous question. As I indicated, if we are not successful in defeating this measure then I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question, if I may.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" when we get to this.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), my classmate and good friend.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise again to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule, amend it, and make in order H.R. 861.

We are just 3 days away from the Department of Homeland Security being without the funds it needs to protect our Nation. Secretary Johnson and agency heads have warned us that if the continuing resolution to fund the Department expires, national security operations will be disrupted and essential personnel will be required to work without pay. They also warn that passing another CR will not address the uncertainty of being able to meet our long-term security needs.

Democrats have a responsible solution. Two weeks ago, Appropriations Committee Ranking Member NITA LOWEY and I introduced H.R. 861, which contains the precise language of the November 2014 bipartisan bill negotiated in good faith by the chairs and ranking members of the House and Senate Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittees.

H.R. 861 is cosponsored by every House Democrat. This bill would pass the House, pass the Senate, and be signed into law by the President. All it needs is for the Republican leadership to do the responsible thing and bring H.R. 861 to the floor for a vote. By doing this, we will demonstrate to the American people that we know our Nation's security takes priority over politics and unrelated policy debates.

To let funding for Homeland Security expire or, instead of a full-year funding bill, take the easy way out by kicking a viable solution down the road with a continuing resolution, is to fail the American people and the trust that they have placed in us as Members of Congress to protect them and our country from harm.

Let's pass H.R. 861 today.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, there are 3 days left until the Department of Homeland Security will shut down. As I have said earlier, I don't believe that is going to happen. I believe my friends will be about the business of making sure that it does not occur. I hope they do because our country needs to make sure that we are not in any insecure position going forward.

Notwithstanding that, the brinksmanship continues, and we are here considering two bills that will go nowhere. That, to me, is the state of play right now. If my friends want to pass these education measures, they need to take care of business first. And it is time to quit messing around.

Mr. Speaker, there is a list of extraordinary organizations in this country that are against H.R. 5. I lift from a list that I will insert into the RECORD the names of the Congressional Tri-Caucus; the American Association of People With Disabilities; the American Association of University Women; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Foundation for the Blind; the Association of University Centers on Disabilities; the Autism National Committee; the Center for American Progress; the Children's Defense Fund;

the Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Easter Seals, which most of us contribute to; the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network; the NAACP; the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the National Association of School Psychologists; and the National Down Syndrome Congress.

Disability plays a major role in this particular legislation, and the fact that all of these organizations are standing up saying that they are opposed to it should get our attention.

In addition, the United Negro College Fund, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 5

Congressional Tri-Caucus, The Advocacy Institute, Afterschool Alliance, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, American Association of People with Disabilities, American Association of University Women, American Federation of Teachers, American Foundation for the Blind, Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Autism National Committee, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Center for American Progress, Center for Law and Social Policy, Children's Defense Fund, Committee for Education Funding, Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, Council of Great City Schools, Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Democrats for Education Reform, Disability Right Education and Defense Fund.

Easter Seals, Education Post, Education Law Center, First Focus Campaign for Children, Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, Human Rights Campaign, The Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Leading Educators, League of United Latin American Citizens, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, NAACP, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, National Association of School Psychologists, National Center for Learning Disabilities, National Council on Independent Living, National Council on Teacher Quality, The National Center on Time and Learning, National Congress of American Indians, National Council of La Raza.

National Coalition for Public Education, National Disability Rights Network, National Down Syndrome Congress, National Education Association, National Urban League, Partners for Each and Every Child, Poverty & Race Research Action Council, Public Advocates Inc., Stand for Children, Southeast Asia Resource Action Center, TASH, Teach Plus, TNTIP, The Education Trust, United Negro College Fund, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HASTINGS. All of these people are opposed to this measure, and yet we find ourselves going forward. It is time for us to get real in this Congress, stop having closed rules, and let all of the Members in this body participate in the decisional process as we argue measures that are needed on behalf of our country.

This is a great institution, and the people that serve here are absolutely wonderful people, but somehow or another we have gotten stuck. And by getting stuck, we are not able to do the things that are vital for the Nation. We need to unstuck it and get on with the business, knowing that we can sit in a room together and come to conclusions

not only about education, but about energy and every aspect of American life that we have a responsibility for.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have lots of agreement with my friend from Florida. I always do. I am always a little surprised by how much I agree with him when he comes down here to talk, but we do need to unstuck this place.

We are talking about two issues today. One is H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, where every Member in this room wants to see our children succeed. Every Member in this room wants to see the achievement gap closed, and yet we grapple with how to achieve that goal together.

We have also in this rule, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 529. That measure passed unanimously out of the Ways and Means Committee. We found a problem, and we found a solution that we could agree on together to move it forward. It is moving forward.

And in the tradition of being unstuck, I am told that just in the last few minutes the Senate has found a pathway to move forward on a DHS funding bill. Again, we passed that bill back on January 14. The Senate has been struggling to find a pathway forward. I don't mean a pathway to pass it. I mean a pathway to even debate it. Apparently, we have seen that wall be broken down here in the last few minutes, and I am glad to hear that.

There is a role to be played, Mr. Speaker. There is a role for this House to play in our constitutional Republic. There is a role for the Senate to play and there is a role for the White House to play. That is true when we are talking about Federal education policy. It is true when we are talking about Homeland Security policy. It is true when we are talking about immigration policy. I am not always satisfied with how well we in the House defend that constitutional prerogative.

Again, we are here today to talk about H.R. 5, which is going to fix a bill passed by an entirely Republican infrastructure here in Congress that today Republicans disavow as being a terrible mistake. They wish we could have done better. I am glad we are striving to do better. It is not a Republican issue, it is not a Democratic issue. It is an American issue. And what could be more American than trying to help our public schools succeed?

You hear a lot of worry in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. You hear folks worried that if we change this provision or if we change that provision, what will be the impact on those children who right now are threatened by a substantial achievement gap in this country? But in the same moment, Mr. Speaker, someone will stand up on the other side of the aisle talking about those very same children and say: If we do not change these provisions today, we will sentence these children to a lifetime of

underperformance, of not being able to meet their full potential.

I don't question anyone's motive on this floor. In fact, I am grateful for the passion that folks have on this floor.

This rule is only step one of H.R. 5, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad for that. When my colleague from Florida spoke earlier about the closed nature of the process and how much better and brighter this institution is when the process is opened, he is exactly right. He is right every time he says it, and I am right every time I say it. It is absolutely true.

It is not fast. It is not efficient. Arguably, sometimes it even borders on dysfunctional. But it is the right thing to do to in order to end up with the best product that we can at the end of the day. And to the degree that we are able to do that, Mr. Speaker, I believe we will continue to strive to do that. This bill today is an example of that.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, just so folks know what they are coming to vote on, doesn't deal with the amendments to the Student Success Act. We are planning on going back to the Rules Committee this afternoon for a completely new hearing in order to make as many amendments as we can available to the underlying bill. This rule is only to have general debate on H.R. 5 before the amendment process begins and to have debate on H.R. 529, that bill that passed unanimously out of the Ways and Means Committee hearing.

So often we come down here and we are talking about divisive issues, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to be down here today talking about something on which we can agree: a good bipartisan bill coming out of Ways and Means, an opportunity to open up the process and have voices be heard on H.R. 5 today and tomorrow.

The gentleman from Florida had it right, Mr. Speaker. I am blessed to be from a part of the country where folks understand that education isn't just something. It is everything.

Don't talk to me about loving opportunity in this country if you don't have a commitment to education. Don't talk to me about lifting folks up from this rung of the ladder to this rung of the economic ladder if you don't have a commitment to education. And don't talk to me about taking somebody else's dollars and spending them on education and thinking that alone is going to create better outcomes for that child.

You need money, absolutely you do, but you need that commitment locally. You need the commitment of teachers, you need the commitment of principals, you need the commitment of mothers and fathers. You need the commitment of communities. And we have yet to figure out how to mandate that commitment from Washington, D.C.

I am grateful that I live in a community where we figured out how to grow it from within. You can walk into the worst school in my district, Mr. Speaker, and you will find folks headed off to

Stanford on scholarships—first-generation Americans; you will find folks headed off to the University of Chicago on full scholarships—folks who come from generational poverty; you will find folks headed off, of course, to the University of Georgia, the finest institution in the United States, because they want to be close to their family and they want to invest in the community that has been so good to them. Hope lives there. Opportunity lives there.

I am grateful to Chairman KLINE and the folks on the Education Committee for doing what they can. It is not all that I would like to see, but to do what they can to get out of the way of those innovators in my community, to do what they can to allow folks to experiment with some things and find out what works, as we have, and then take those local ideas and spread those ideas locally, do what they can to prevent the Federal Government from saying: We know best how to educate children, and instead turning the Federal Government just into a funding stream, where we can, to say: You know how to educate children. We trust you.

So often we conflate issues in this body, Mr. Speaker. The issue is not that children can't learn. They can. The issue is not that public schools can't teach. They can and they do. But there is an issue with generational poverty. There is an issue with an achievement gap.

I am not sure that H.R. 5, no matter who crafted it and how long we work to do it, I am not sure that we can solve that problem with H.R. 5. In fact, I don't believe that we could—not with any Elementary and Secondary Education Act bill.

We are doing what we can today, and I hope we will be back in this institution tomorrow to do more. Goodness knows, we do a lot of things in this town that disadvantage that next generation of Americans. I am proud today to be working on at least one bill that will do something to advantage those young people and their future.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 121 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consider-

ation of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 861.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous ques-

tion on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 121, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1020.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 181, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Aderholt	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Allen	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Babin	Ellmers (NC)	Jolly
Barletta	Emmer (MN)	Jones
Barr	Farenthold	Jordan
Barton	Fincher	Joyce
Benishek	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (MI)	Fleming	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Flores	King (NY)
Black	Forbes	Kinzinger (IL)
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Kline
Blum	Fox	Knight
Bost	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Lamborn
Brat	Gibbs	Lance
Bridenstine	Gibson	Latta
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Brooks (IN)	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Buchanan	Gosar	Love
Buck	Gowdy	Lucas
Bucshon	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Calvert	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Marino
Chabot	Grothman	Massie
Chaffetz	Guinta	McCarthy
Clawson (FL)	Guthrie	McCaul
Coffman	Hanna	McClintock
Cole	Hardy	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Harper	McKinley
Collins (NY)	Harris	McMorris
Comstock	Hartzler	Rodgers
Conaway	Heck (NV)	McSally
Cook	Hensarling	Meadows
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	Messer
Crawford	Hill	Mica
Crenshaw	Holding	Miller (FL)
Culberson	Hudson	Miller (MI)
Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp	Moolenaar
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Mooney (WV)
Denham	Hultgren	Mullin
Dent	Hunter	Mulvaney
DeSantis	Hurd (TX)	Murphy (PA)
DesJarlais	Hurt (VA)	Neugebauer

Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi

Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Hinojosa
Lee
Long

McNerney
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Wilson (FL)

□ 1411

Ms. BASS, Mr. SIREs, and Ms. PIN-GREE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 178, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance

Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trotter
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski

NOES—178

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Israel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer
Byrne
Hinojosa
Lee

Long
McNerney
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Wilson (FL)

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEM EDUCATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1020) to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 8, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—412

Abraham	Connolly	Graham
Adams	Conyers	Granger
Aderholt	Cook	Graves (GA)
Aguilar	Cooper	Graves (LA)
Allen	Costa	Graves (MO)
Amodel	Costello (PA)	Grayson
Ashford	Courtney	Green, Al
Babin	Cramer	Green, Gene
Barletta	Crawford	Griffith
Barr	Crenshaw	Grijalva
Barton	Crowley	Grothman
Bass	Cuellar	Guinta
Beatty	Culberson	Guthrie
Becerra	Cummings	Gutiérrez
Benishek	Curbelo (FL)	Hahn
Bera	Davis (CA)	Hanna
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Hardy
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Harris
Bishop (MI)	DeGette	Hartzler
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Hastings
Black	DeLauro	Heck (NV)
Blackburn	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Blum	Denham	Hensarling
Blumenauer	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Bonamici	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Bost	DeSaulnier	Higgins
Boustany	DesJarlais	Hill
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Himes
F.	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Honda
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Hoyer
Bridenstine	Dold	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Doyle, Michael	Huelskamp
Brooks (IN)	F.	Huffman
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Huizenga (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Duffy	Hultgren
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Bucshon	Edwards	Hurd (TX)
Burgess	Ellison	Hurt (VA)
Bustos	Ellmers (NC)	Israel
Butterfield	Emmer (MN)	Issa
Calvert	Engel	Jackson Lee
Capps	Eshoo	Jeffries
Capuano	Esty	Jenkins (KS)
Cárdenas	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
Carney	Farr	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Johnson (OH)
Carter (GA)	Fincher	Johnson, E. B.
Carter (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Cartwright	Fleischmann	Jolly
Castor (FL)	Fleming	Jones
Castro (TX)	Flores	Jordan
Chabot	Forbes	Joyce
Chaffetz	Fortenberry	Kaptur
Chu, Judy	Foster	Katko
Ciilline	Fox	Keating
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Clawson (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy
Clay	Fudge	Kildee
Cleaver	Gabbard	Kilmer
Clyburn	Gallego	Kind
Coffman	Garamendi	King (NY)
Cohen	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Cole	Gibson	Kirkpatrick
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Kline
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Knight
Comstock	Gosar	Kuster
Conaway	Gowdy	Labrador

LaMalfa	Nunes	Sherman
Lamborn	O'Rourke	Shimkus
Lance	Olson	Shuster
Langevin	Palazzo	Simpson
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Sinema
Larson (CT)	Palmer	Sires
Latta	Pascrell	Slaughter
Lawrence	Paulsen	Smith (MO)
Levin	Payne	Smith (NE)
Lewis	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Smith (TX)
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
LoBiondo	Perry	Stefanik
Loeb	Peters	Stewart
Lofgren	Peterson	Stivers
Loudermilk	Pingree	Stutzman
Love	Pittenger	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Pitts	Takai
Lowe	Pocan	Takano
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Thompson (CA)
Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham	Polis	Thompson (PA)
(NM)	Pompeo	Thornberry
Lujan, Ben Ray	Possey	Tiberi
(NM)	Price (NC)	Tipton
Lummis	Price, Tom	Titus
Lynch	Quigley	Tonko
MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Torres
Maloney,	Reed	Trott
Carolyn	Reichert	Tsongas
Maloney, Sean	Renacci	Turner
Marchant	Ribble	Upton
Marino	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Massie	Richmond	Van Hollen
Matsui	Rigell	Vargas
McCarthy	Roby	Veasey
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Vela
McCollum	Rogers (KY)	Velázquez
McDermott	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
McGovern	Rokita	Wagner
McHenry	Rooney (FL)	Walberg
McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
McMorris	Roskam	Walker
Rodgers	Ross	Walorski
McSally	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi
Meadows	Rouzer	Walz
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Meeks	Royce	Schultz
Meng	Ruiz	Waters, Maxine
Messer	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Mica	Rush	Weber (TX)
Miller (FL)	Russell	Webster (FL)
Miller (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Moolenaar	Ryan (WI)	Wenstrup
Moore (WV)	Salmon	Westerman
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Whitfield
Moulton	Sarbanes	Williams
Mullin	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Mulvaney	Schakowsky	Wittman
Murphy (FL)	Schiff	Womack
Murphy (PA)	Schock	Woodall
Nadler	Schrader	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Schweikert	Yoder
Neal	Scott (VA)	Yoho
Neugebauer	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Newhouse	Scott, David	Young (IA)
Noem	Sensenbrenner	Young (IN)
Nolan	Serrano	Zeldin
Norcross	Sessions	Zinke
Nugent	Sewell (AL)	

NAYS—8

Amash	Duncan (SC)	Sanford
Brat	Garrett	Westmoreland
Buck	McClintock	

NOT VOTING—12

Byrne	McNerney	Sánchez, Linda
Hinojosa	Rangel	T.
King (IA)	Rice (NY)	Speier
Lee	Roe (TN)	Wilson (FL)
Long		

□ 1429

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUESTING UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO CALL UP H.R. 861, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill to protect America that would keep the Department open so that we can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe and, as well, protecting our national security over political security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

SECTION 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS AMENDMENTS

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 121, I call up the bill (H.R. 529) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 121, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 529

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) When the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 became law, the tax treatment of section 529 college savings plans was changed so that qualified distributions were no longer taxed as income. The favorable tax treatment of college savings plans was made permanent with the passage of the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

(2) Section 529 college savings plans empower middle-class families to accumulate savings to offset the rising costs of attending college.

(3) The latest data from the College Savings Plan Network shows that there are 11.83 million 529 accounts open throughout all 50 states, which represent \$244.5 billion in total assets. The average 529 account size is \$20,671.

(4) States that sponsor 529 college savings plans have taken steps to ensure these plans are a tool that all families can use to save for college, including setting minimum contributions as low as \$25 per month to encourage participation by families of all income levels.

(5) The President's fiscal year 2016 Budget proposes raising taxes by taxing certain future distributions made from 529 college savings plans.

(6) The tax proposed by the President would discourage the use of 529 college savings plans, requiring families and students to take on more debt.

(7) Purchase of a computer represents a significant higher education expense and therefore

should be eligible for qualified distributions under 529 college savings plans.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1) enact policies that strengthen 529 college savings plans, and

(2) make 529 plans more modern, consumer-friendly, and responsive to the realities faced by students today.

SEC. 2. COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT PERMANENTLY ALLOWED AS A QUALIFIED HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSE FOR SECTION 529 ACCOUNTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 529(e)(3)(A)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) expenses for the purchase of computer or peripheral equipment (as defined in section 168(i)(2)(B)), computer software (as defined in section 197(e)(3)(B)), or Internet access and related services, if such equipment, software, or services are to be used primarily by the beneficiary during any of the years the beneficiary is enrolled at an eligible educational institution.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF DISTRIBUTION AGGREGATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 529(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. RECONTRIBUTION OF REFUNDED AMOUNTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 529(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 3, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **SPECIAL RULE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF REFUNDED AMOUNTS.**—In the case of a beneficiary who receives a refund of any qualified higher education expenses from an eligible educational institution, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to that portion of any distribution for the taxable year which is recontributed to a qualified tuition program of which such individual is a beneficiary, but only to the extent such recontribution is made not later than 60 days after the date of such refund and does not exceed the refunded amount.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to refunds of qualified higher education expenses after December 31, 2014.

(2) **TRANSITION RULE.**—In the case of a refund of qualified higher education expenses received after December 31, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, section 529(c)(3)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) shall be applied by substituting “not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph” for “not later than 60 days after the date of such refund”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 529, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this critical and timely issue and my colleague Congressman KIND of Wisconsin for 4 years of bipartisan efforts to encourage families to invest for their children's future.

I rise today in support of H.R. 529, my legislation that reaffirms Congress' commitment to not only preserving, but strengthening, expanding, and modernizing 529 college savings plans.

Currently, there are nearly 12 million 529 accounts open in all 50 States. Considering there were only 1 million accounts open in 2001, the growth in popularity of these accounts is truly remarkable and is still on an upward trajectory.

The popularity of 529 accounts among American families is no mystery. Higher education costs across the country are rising at a pace that exceeds the rate of inflation, and folks are looking for ways to plan responsibly for the future.

A 2014 Gallup Poll of America's top financial concerns showed that among adults between the ages of 30 and 49, “not having enough money to pay for your children's college” is a top concern for families, trailing only retirement concerns.

It is natural that folks would turn toward 529 savings accounts. These accounts are easy to set up and use and accountholders can make a monthly contribution as small as \$10 to invest to their children's future on a tax-deferred basis.

The 12 million 529 accounts today have an average balance of around \$20,000, which will go a long way toward helping families offset college costs and helping students to begin their careers with a lighter debt burden.

When the President proposed a plan in his 2016 budget to tax future distributions from 529 savings accounts, Members on both sides of the aisle were appalled.

His billion-dollar tax proposal on families saving for college would have completely eliminated the purpose of saving responsibly for higher education in the first place and would have inevitably moved more students toward student loans and other sources of financial aid.

We fundamentally disagree with the direction of the President's policy proposal, and instead, we want to make 529 college savings plans more consumer friendly and reflective of the realities faced by students today.

This legislation will make computer purchases with 529 plans a qualified expense. Computers are an essential part of higher education, and the law should be updated to reflect that.

A Pew Research Center report in 2011 found that a vast majority of undergraduate, graduate, and community

college students use some sort of computer to participate in a college experience that now features online courses, class work, and e-textbooks. I believe this is a commonsense modernization measure.

The bill will also remove distribution aggregation requirements, which are an outdated burden on 529 plan administrators and States. When 529 college savings plans were originated back in 1996, the funds were taxed before they were deposited into the account and then taxed a second time when they were used to pay for higher education expenses.

At that time, it made sense for plan administrators to aggregate accounts for beneficiaries with multiple 529 accounts in order to determine the taxable dollars dispersed among the accounts.

However, the law was changed back in 2001 so that 529 savings are only taxed once now, before they are put into the 529 account. The only taxable funds at disbursement are for non-qualified expenses. According to a GAO report from 2012 that has the most recent data on the topic, nonqualified distributions from 529 plans only made up 5.3 percent of total distributions in 2010.

Because of the past changes to tax treatment of 529s, it no longer makes sense for plan administrators to aggregate these accounts for tax purposes. It represents an undue burden, which could potentially raise the administrative cost for operating these plans. This is why this legislation will remove these requirements.

Finally, the bill will allow a student who receives a refund on any 529 qualified expenses to redeposit those funds into their 529 without penalty.

Refunds of 529 dollars could happen for any number of reasons: a student may withdraw from a certain course, may receive a scholarship offer or other financial aid after their 529 plans have already been used, or may have to withdraw from school because of an illness.

Whatever the reasons, subjecting these funds to a penalty works against the spirit of 529 college savings plans, and this bill will correct that.

These are sensible yet important improvements to 529 college savings plans that should receive resounding support from both sides of the aisle. As we continue our work in the House to empower hardworking families with bottom-up solutions, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am a strong supporter of 529 college savings plans. When I cochaired the Education and Family Tax Working Group with Representative DIANE BLACK from Tennessee during the 113th Congress, we heard from education stakeholders that education tax benefits should reflect a three-legged stool

with one leg helping families save for college, one leg helping families pay for college, and one leg helping families repay college.

College is, indeed, expensive, and it is a wise public investment to use Federal incentives to encourage families to save for college.

H.R. 529 makes three important improvements to 529 accounts: one, it makes computer technology an allowable expense; two, it improves the calculation for taxing distributions to better reflect one's earnings; and, three, it allows distributions that are refunded by a college upon a student's withdrawal to be reinvested in 529 accounts within 60 days without being subject to a tax.

I support these important improvements to 529 education plans. In addition, I hope that the Republican leadership will advance the bill's sister bill, the Savings Enhancement for Education in College Act, which was H.R. 529 in the last Congress and also championed by Representatives JENKINS and KIND.

This former H.R. 529 bill includes the two substantive improvements to 529s that advocates explain would best help middle-income families save more for college.

We know that low- and moderate-income families have a harder time saving for college because they have less extra cash available to put away in a savings account.

The Savings Enhancement for Education in College Act would substantially help low- and middle-income families save by allowing low-income taxpayers to take advantage of the saver's credit and allowing employers to match up to \$600 a year in 529 contributions.

I think that these provisions are excellent. The saver's credit currently helps offset part of the first \$2,000 that low-income workers voluntarily contribute to IRA and 401(k) plans. Extending this tax benefit for 529 plans is a commonsense way to help increase college savings by low- and moderate-income families.

Further, I think that the employer match is an especially promising tool to improve college savings by lower-income Americans because it adds \$600 a family didn't have for college before that can grow and support education over time.

These two improvements are needed because the savings data show that 529 savings have dropped tremendously since 2009. From 2005 to 2009, around 60 percent of the accounts saw contributions; however, in the last few years, the account contributions have been closer to 45 percent.

I am a bit surprised that these substantive improvements are not included in the bill before us today, and I truly hope that Republican leadership will advance these 529 provisions that would tremendously improve savings for lower- and middle-income Americans.

In the interest of fairness, I also hope that we make computer technology an allowable expense for the American opportunity tax credit.

Currently, computers and software are not qualified expenses for the AOTC, and I think that the definition of qualified expenses should be uniform across 529s and AOTC benefits. These are all great improvements that have, in fact, been made.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it won't be all that much time. I just simply want to congratulate the gentlelady from Kansas on bringing this legislation forward. We brought this out of committee. We had no resistance because this is just a commonsense bill.

This upgrades the law to reflect the realities of a college education. You ought to be able to buy a computer. You ought to be able to buy software with your college savings dollars because it is an essential ingredient to your education.

More importantly, if a person gets a refund if they cancel a class, if for some reason the college rebates money to you, you ought to be able to put it back into your savings plan. These are commonsense ideas that make this important vehicle for savings more workable and reflects the common problems that people have in this 21st century.

It is essential that we give people and families the ability to save for education. This bill also sends a signal: we believe in the 529 plans; 529 plans are going to stay; they are a good thing; we are not going to attack them; we are going to develop and grow them.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who is a cosponsor of this legislation and a tireless advocate for education.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding me this time.

I want to thank my partner in crafting this legislation, Representative JENKINS. This has been the product of a few years of hard work, of listening to various outside groups and trying to understand the difficulty of saving for higher education that many working families are experiencing today.

The legislation before us, H.R. 529, as the chairman of the committee just pointed out, is a commonsense proposal with some reasonable technical corrections to the 529 savings plans that already exist in all 50 States, allowing for the qualification expense for computers and software, which is a new learning tool that sometimes is required in the classroom for higher edu-

cation. It allows for the refund of tuition and expenses if you had to withdraw from college for some reason, and it also reduces and minimizes the unnecessary bureaucratic and administrative paperwork. In that respect, there are some commonsense steps that we can do to modernize the 529 program and make sure that it is working for more families.

I do agree with my colleague from Illinois that we have a challenge of trying to democratize these programs a lot more. We have roughly 3 percent participation rate in 529s throughout the entire Nation. We have got to figure out a way to do a better job of increasing those savings opportunities for more families, but especially lower income families that don't have the disposable income right now in order to participate in these programs, whether it is the tax credit that Representative DAVIS was talking about, employer matches, by thinking creatively of how we can democratize these so more families can take advantage of them. That is going to be crucial.

In Wisconsin alone, we have got roughly 257,000 accounts in the State Edvest program and Tomorrow's Scholar 529 plans. The families have saved about \$3.7 billion for college or their technical schools, reducing the need for greater student loans, helping them access college. These programs not only encourage savings for college but help middle class families get in the habit of saving for other important life events, such as retirement, that we have to do a better job at.

I also think, given that the Congressional Budget Office has a cost associated with it, which is roughly \$5 million a year—not a lot in Federal budget terms—that there is no reason at all why we couldn't have brought this legislation to the floor today with an acceptable pay-for so we are not adding any deficit to future generations.

In fact, again, Representative DAVIS offered, during the committee markup, a responsible amendment that would have done a better job of means testing the 529 contributions and cutting it off to families that earn up to \$3 million. Now, to put this in perspective, the top 1 percent of income earners in Wisconsin earn less than \$1 million. So it was still a very generous, high threshold, but it was enough money to pay for the \$51 million expense over the next 10 years that the Congressional Budget Office scored this at. There is no reason why we can't be making these type of tough decisions as well when it comes to policy changes that make sense for working families and act in a more fiscally responsible manner.

I think these 529 accounts have been established. They do work well for those who can participate. And this is especially important for a State like Wisconsin today, whose Governor just submitted a budget proposal calling for a cut of over \$300 million out of our university system, a university system

that is really the pride and joy of the State of Wisconsin, has given us a competitive advantage, not only in the upper Midwest, but throughout the Nation and the world, where we had some of the top scholars and researchers wanting to come there to do their work, students wanting to stay in the State so they can participate in these UW system colleges and universities that we have.

Obviously, the Governor wants to take it in a different direction; \$300 million worth of cuts gets into the bone. So, again, we have got to think creatively of how we can make it affordable for families to be able to send their kids on to school. This is one way to do it: savings in 529s.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

We ought not also ignore other important financial aid programs that especially speak to the needs of low-income children: the Pell grant program, work-study opportunities on and off campus, the GEAR UP and TRIO programs. This, too, helps many students—including myself, who is the first generation that went on to school—to be able to afford higher education so we are not driving these kids deeper and deeper into debt. The average undergrad in Wisconsin, by the time they graduate, has \$28,000 worth of debt. It is the second largest debt in the Nation behind mortgages. At \$1.2 trillion, it exceeds all credit card debt.

So the 529 is another vehicle to try to alleviate that student indebtedness issue that is affecting more and more kids and families throughout the Nation. We ought to fix it by making a pay-for. This is a good first step, necessary policy changes. I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), an esteemed member of the House Committee on Ways and Means and subcommittee chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, do you notice something? Did you notice that, as Speaker and the person who is presiding over this Chamber today, oftentimes you hear a great deal of difficulty between the two parties and a lot of wrangling and a lot of different positions and so forth that manifests itself in arguing and so forth, but did you notice something? You are hearing both sides of the aisle coming before you and coming before this House and saying the same thing, and that is we ought to move H.R. 529.

There is a recognition, and I think my constituency in suburban Chicago is breathing a collective sigh of relief

right now because they are saying: Hey, people are paying attention to things that matter to me and matter to my future and matter to my children, that is, they are taking a bill or a provision in the law that has been successful and they are improving it. They are bringing it up to date under the leadership of the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), and she is joined by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), and everybody is coming together around that idea that says 529s need to be protected and defended. And we need to make sure that they are kept up to date, because back home this makes all the difference in the world. I think this is one of these types of moments that is very significant and that we can build on.

I thank the gentlelady for her leadership. I thank Mr. DAVIS for his, and I rise in strong support of this measure.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, I thank the gentlelady, and I thank the Speaker.

It is good news to be able to come on the floor of the House and be able to speak to hardworking parents and the basis of all of our joy when we are giving an opportunity for our young people to be able to participate in higher learning, in this instance, college education. The 529 fix, if you will, deals with the savings accounts and tax-free disbursements for the purpose of paying for college tuition, purchasing college credits, and other qualified educational expenses.

I do want to join my colleague from Wisconsin and add that the idea of other equipment dealing with the new technology special needs services is crucial.

I want to thank Mr. DAVIS for his astute work in the committee, looking to make this a little bit more balanced. Certainly we are appreciative of those who have been successful and have achieved financial success. I enjoy that. But I do think with our concern about a deficit—which, by the way, has been reduced substantially under President Barack Obama—that this idea that Mr. DAVIS had would have been a worthy inclusion into this legislation.

However, I am grateful, again, that we are now high tech and the 529 accounts include computers and software as qualified educational expenses. It would also allow for refunded tuition, educational expenses, particularly if a student withdraws due to illness.

I was talking to one of my young people, college students, and also my husband is a part of the team of higher education and sees it all the time where youngsters leave because they are ill and fail to let the professor know, and all of a sudden they are running up a bill.

I do want to say that this fix is urgent because we need to help people

save, but it is also urgent, Mr. Speaker, that we immediately move to put the Homeland Security funding on the floor of the House. I had asked yesterday for it to be immediately put on the floor of the House last night or today in order to do our duty, and our duty is to ensure the safety and security of this Nation.

It is sad for me to note that those like Border Patrol agents and ICE agents and TSOs whom we pass by every day will be some of those who will be unpaid. They are essential, and we will go past them and thank them for their services—I often do in airports across America—but yet we will stand here and not have a resolution and a solution to pay them their salary.

We had a hearing today in Judiciary. I was very glad to note that I think the weight was on the side of the President that he had constitutional authority, that he is not rendering any immigration status, that he is doing what he is allowed under the law; the Attorney General is allowed to have discretion as to employment status; no benefits will be conveyed on these individuals; and, frankly, we have an emergency and we need to pass that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I won't take that. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Let me just say that I think we appropriately are on the floor dealing with H.R. 529. I again thank the work of the Committee on Ways and Means ranking members and, as well, the ranking member and chairman of the full committee.

But as we frame the work that this Congress must do, I don't know how we stand here on Wednesday, 24 to 48 hours out from a collapse of the Department of Homeland Security, no funding, and actually are here and looking out at the face of first responders and those who are on the front lines of borders, airports, FAA, ICE officers, and we would stand and hold hostage these hardworking Americans who, in this climate when we are looking to malls or we are hearing, seeing videos and various charges of those who want to do harm, that we would not want an orderly process for 5 million people who have about 14 items—14 items—that they must comply with to even be eligible, but 5 million people who simply want us to know that they are here and they are here to do good and not to do harm. That is an orderly process for knowing how to secure this Nation.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

With that, I ask for a vote for H.R. 529 and H.R. 5 and the funding of Homeland Security.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the

well while another Member is under recognition.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our majority leader.

□ 1500

Mr. MCCARTHY. I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her work on 529 and bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, during the President's speech on the State of the Union, he presented what he called "middle class economics." It didn't take long for people to realize that the President's plan meant taxing the middle class to pay for bigger government and pipe dream projects. Nothing demonstrated this anti-middle class agenda more than the President's plan to attack education opportunity for middle class families by taxing 529 saving accounts. Now, after families cried out against the President's plan, he dropped it, and I am happy about that. The President has rightly chosen to not do harm, but now he should work with the House to do some positive good.

My wife and I have two children—Connor and Meghan. Connor is in college today, and Meghan is a senior about to enter college. When we found out, with joy, that we were to have children, we didn't have much great wealth, but we started putting away \$50 a month. Why? Because we dreamt like every other American. It was no longer what you could become but what opportunities your children will have.

Education has been the great equalizer in this country, and there is no greater way to do that than by allowing those who may not have great wealth but who have a great opportunity with their children to have a 529 account. But, like anything, we should modernize it because education changes just as technology has changed.

Could you imagine today sending your children to college but telling them to learn without having a computer? Isn't that a part of the education system, too? That is what this 529 account will also expand to. So, today, when we talk on the floor, it is really about the future, but it is about the future of every single family from every walk of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I differ with the President on many issues, and I would say the majority of this House differs with the President in that he would tax every parent or every grandparent who wanted to put away for a brighter future for their child or grandchild. Luckily, he turned back. Today is a chance to work with us, to work with us on a greater America with something that is stronger. What that means today is that we can all join so the 21st century can be even stronger, and we can keep the promise we made to every American—that every generation will improve on the generation be-

fore him. That is the opportunity that this 529 account gives us.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

I agree with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) that this is, indeed, a bipartisan piece of legislation and that it is good for higher education and for those who are attempting to access it.

I want to commend Ms. JENKINS and Mr. KIND for their leadership in developing it. I agree with its purpose, and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for engaging in this informative and productive debate. If America is going to remain competitive, I cannot imagine a more important thing than maintaining the affordability of higher education. There is much to be done, but today's vote is a critical and simple step that Congress should take to empower folks to save for higher education and, ultimately, to make it more attainable for more hardworking Americans.

I hope that Congress passes this legislation today with the broad support that it deserves so that we can give American families an improved way to invest in their 529 college savings plans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of 529 college savings plans—including the College Savings Plans of Maryland—I am pleased to support today's legislation, which makes three common sense technical changes to these valuable savings tools.

First, HR 529 makes the purchase of a computer and internet access a qualified expense for 529 accounts, reflecting the reality that computers and the internet are a modern necessity for today's college students. Second, the bill allows students who receive refunds from colleges to reinvest those refunds back into their 529 accounts, provided that reinvestment occurs within 60 days of a student leaving college. And finally, the bill eliminates the existing aggregation requirement for purposes of calculating distributions that are includible in a beneficiary's taxable income.

Mr. Speaker, unlike other tax bills that have come before us recently, today's legislation does not seek to permanently extend temporary provisions of the code without paying for that permanence—and it does not add tens of billions of dollars to the national debt. Rather, HR 529 makes several modest improvements to a program already permanently authorized in law—and it does so at a much lower cost.

Accordingly, I will cast a yes vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H.R. 529, a bill that would expand section 529 college savings plans, when it passed the House today. I strongly believe in improving access to higher education, and encouraging families to save for college is a critical part of

this in an era of rising tuition costs and deepening student debt. Since 1996, 529 plans have saved American families more than \$225 billion. H.R. 529 makes several changes to update 529 plans, including removing penalties for students who are forced to withdraw from college and expanding the eligible uses. While I will vote for this bill, I wish this Congress would do more. The cost of higher education continues to increase and millions of American students carry non-dischargeable debt that totals over \$1 trillion. At the same time, my Republican colleagues have slashed Pell grants, refused to provide students with the low interest rates granted to America's biggest banks, and continue to support predatory, for-profit institutions that shortchange our most vulnerable students. I support the modest improvements in H.R. 529, but I urge my colleagues to take up further measures to improve access to college and reduce student loan debt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 121, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. I am opposed to it in its current form.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ted Lieu of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 529 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 5. PARENTS' RIGHT TO KNOW COST OF BROKERAGE FEES AND IMPACT ON LONG-TERM SAVINGS.

Section 529(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking "REPORTS.—Each officer"

and inserting the following: "REPORTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each officer", and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) FEES.—Each such officer or employee shall make an annual report to each designated beneficiary of an account under such program—

"(A) disclosing the type and amount of fees with respect to such account,

"(B) demonstrating the impact of such fees on the investment returns of such account over a 10-year and 20-year period, and

"(C) disclosing the range of fees for investments available to accounts under such program."

SEC. 6. RATES OF RETURN AND LOW FEES.

Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) RATES OF RETURN AND LOW FEES.—Each officer or employee having control of

the qualified tuition program shall take such steps as are necessary to ensure, to the extent practicable, high rates of return and low fees under such program.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Let me start by thanking my Republican colleagues for introducing this bill. It makes changes to 529 plans that many on my side of the aisle have also been calling on for years. I support 529 plans, as do many of my constituents. It helps people plan and pay for college, and my wife and I currently invest in 529 plans.

There is one amendment to this bill that, I believe, will make it far better, and that is disclosure. The motion to recommit would put in an amendment that says that there has to be a separate report that talks about the types and numbers of fees and how much these fees are and how they impact the performance of the product over 10 to 20 years.

Prior to entering politics, I served as a corporate vice president at a financial services company, and it is clear that the foundation upon which Wall Street rests is disclosure. It is the social compact that Wall Street has with Main Street. It is the compact that they have with investors in that they will describe a product—how it works, the fees on that product, and how it performs. By having a separate report that parents can see, one that talks about the fees on these products and how these fees impact the performance, it will allow middle class families to better gauge for themselves how their investments are doing and which investments to select. Does this make a difference? Yes, it does. Let me give you an example.

Savingforcollege.com offers this scenario:

If an annual return for a 529 account is 7 percent and if one account charges 20 basis points and another charges 40 basis points, here is the difference on an investment of \$5,000: over the course of 18 years, the 529 plan charging the lower fees will save the investor \$542. The underlying bill would change existing law to allow 529 funds to be used to purchase a laptop computer for school, and \$542 would allow you to buy a laptop.

Right now, every State has different rules for disclosure, and they have different fees. For example, in my State of California, we have relatively low fees that range between \$142 to \$154 over 10 years, but then you have States like Montana and Arkansas, which have some of the highest low-end fees, which could range between \$1,100 to \$1,200 over 10 years. That makes a huge difference to middle class families.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit, which merely provides disclosure to middle class families so they can better understand their 529 plans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

This motion would do the exact opposite of what this legislation is trying to accomplish. This bill is attempting to simplify 529s, but this motion would add unneeded complexity, leading to fewer people saving for a college education. It would burden all families who are saving as well as burden States and plan administrators with more red tape. As the former State treasurer of Kansas, I believe I can offer a unique insight from my experiences with 529 plan administration.

This simply adds an undo administrative burden. It increases the costs, which would leave less money for students to spend on their higher education costs. It seems to mandate the increase of rates of return, and Congress should not be in the business of setting the risk of a personal investment. It increases administrative expenses, and it goes in the opposite direction of the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 176, nays 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—176

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra

Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos

Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson, Maxine
Waters Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NAYS—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer

Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie

Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love

Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Smith (TX)
Lummis	Pompeo	Stefanik
MacArthur	Posey	Stewart
Marchant	Price, Tom	Stivers
Marino	Ratcliffe	Stutzman
Massie	Reed	Thompson (PA)
McCarthy	Reichert	Thornberry
McCaul	Renacci	Tiberi
McClintock	Ribble	Tipton
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Trott
McKinley	Rigell	Turner
McMorris	Roby	Upton
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Valadao
McSally	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
Meadows	Rohrabacher	Walberg
Meehan	Rokita	Walden
Messer	Rooney (FL)	Walker
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Walorski
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Walters, Mimi
Miller (MI)	Ross	Weber (TX)
Moolenaar	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
Mooney (WV)	Rouzer	Wenstrup
Mullin	Royce	Westerman
Mulvaney	Russell	Westmoreland
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Williams
Neugebauer	Sanford	Wilson (SC)
Newhouse	Scalise	Wittman
Noem	Schock	Womack
Nugent	Schweikert	Woodall
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Olson	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Palazzo	Sessions	Young (AK)
Palmer	Shimkus	Young (IA)
Paulsen	Shuster	Young (IN)
Pearce	Simpson	Zeldin
Perry	Sinema	Zinke
Pittenger	Smith (MO)	
Pitts	Smith (NE)	

NOT VOTING—13

Byrne	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Costa	McNerney	T.
Hinojosa	Rice (NY)	Speier
Lee	Roe (TN)	Wilson (FL)
Long	Rush	

□ 1541

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. LABRADOR, ISSA, SANFORD, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. DUFFY, WALDEN, FLORES, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to reiterate the announcement of March 25, 2014, concerning floor practice.

Members should periodically rededicate themselves to the core principles of proper parliamentary practice that are so essential in maintaining order and deliberacy here in the House. The Chair believes that a few of these principles bear emphasis today.

Members should refrain from trafficking in the well when another, including the presiding officer, is addressing the House.

Members should wear appropriate business attire during all sittings of the House, however brief their appearance on the floor may be.

Members should refrain from engaging in still photography or audio or video recording in the Chamber. Taking unofficial photographs detracts from the dignity of the proceedings and presents security and privacy challenges for the House.

Members who wish to speak on the floor should respectfully seek and ob-

tain recognition from the presiding officer, taking the time to do so in proper form, including 1-minutes. The proper form would be to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

□ 1545

Members should take care to yield and reclaim time in an orderly fashion, bearing in mind that the Official Reporters of Debate cannot properly transcribe two Members simultaneously.

Members should address their remarks in debate to the presiding officer and not to others in the second person or to some perceived viewing audience.

Members should not embellish the offering of a motion, the entry of a request, the making of a point of order, or the entry of an appeal with any statement of motive or other commentary, and should be aware that such utterances could render the motion, request, point of order, or appeal untimely.

Members should attempt to come to the floor within the 15-minute period as prescribed by the first ringing of the bells. This has been an ongoing problem and Members should make every attempt to be here within the prescribed 15 minutes. Members should be advised that if they are in the Chamber attempting to vote, the Chair will try to accommodate them. But as a point of courtesy to each of your colleagues, voting within the allotted time would help with the maintenance of the institution.

Following these basic standards of practice will foster an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect. It will ensure against personal confrontation, among individual Members or between Members and the presiding officer. It will facilitate Members' comprehension of, and participation in, the business of the House. It will enable accurate transcriptions of proceedings. In sum, it will ensure the comity that elevates spirited deliberations above mere argument.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to these matters.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 401, noes 20, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

AYES—401

Abraham	Aderholt	Allen
Adams	Aguilar	Amash

Amodei	Doyle, Michael	Knight
Ashford	F.	Kuster
Babin	Duckworth	Labrador
Barletta	Duffy	LaMalfa
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Lamborn
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Lance
Bass	Edwards	Langevin
Beatty	Ellmers (NC)	Larsen (WA)
Becerra	Emmer (MN)	Larson (CT)
Benishek	Engel	Latta
Bera	Eshoo	Lawrence
Beyer	Esty	Levin
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Lewis
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Lieu, Ted
Bishop (MI)	Fattah	Lipinski
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	LoBiondo
Black	Fitzpatrick	Loehsack
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Lofgren
Blum	Fleming	Loudermilk
Blumenauer	Flores	Love
Bonamici	Forbes	Lowenthal
Bost	Fortenberry	Lowe
Boustany	Foster	Lucas
Boyle, Brendan	Fox	Luetkemeyer
F.	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA)	Franks (AZ)	(NM)
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brat	Gabbard	(NM)
Bridenstine	Gallego	Lummis
Brooks (AL)	Garamendi	Lynch
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	MacArthur
Brown (FL)	Gibbs	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Gibson	Carolyn
Buchanan	Gohmert	Maloney, Sean
Buck	Goodlatte	Marchant
Bucshon	Gosar	Marino
Burgess	Gowdy	Massie
Bustos	Graham	Matsui
Butterfield	Granger	McCarthy
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Capps	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Capuano	Graves (MO)	McDermott
Cárdenas	Grayson	McGovern
Carney	Green, Al	McHenry
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	McKinley
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McMorris
Carter (TX)	Grothman	Rodgers
Cartwright	Guinta	McSally
Castor (FL)	Guthrie	Meadows
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez	Meehan
Chabot	Hahn	Meeks
Chaffetz	Hanna	Meng
Chu, Judy	Hardy	Messer
Ciilline	Harper	Mica
Clark (MA)	Harris	Miller (FL)
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Clay	Heck (NV)	Moolenaar
Cleaver	Heck (WA)	Mooney (WV)
Clyburn	Hensarling	Moore
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Moulton
Cohen	Hice, Jody B.	Mullin
Cole	Higgins	Mulvaney
Collins (GA)	Hill	Murphy (FL)
Collins (NY)	Himes	Murphy (PA)
Comstock	Holding	Nadler
Conaway	Honda	Neal
Connolly	Hudson	Neugebauer
Conyers	Huelskamp	Newhouse
Cook	Huffman	Noem
Cooper	Huizenga (MI)	Nolan
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Norcross
Courtney	Hunter	Nugent
Cramer	Hurd (TX)	Nunes
Crawford	Hurt (VA)	O'Rourke
Crenshaw	Israel	Olson
Crowley	Issa	Palazzo
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Culberson	Jeffries	Palmer
Cummings	Jenkins (KS)	Pascarell
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Paulsen
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
DeFazio	Jolly	Perlmutter
DeGette	Jordan	Perry
Delaney	Joyce	Peters
DeLauro	Katko	Peterson
DelBene	Keating	Pingree
Denham	Kelly (IL)	Pittenger
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Pitts
DeSantis	Kennedy	Poe (TX)
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Poliquin
DesJarlais	Kilmer	Polis
Deutch	Kind	Pompeo
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Posey
Dingell	King (NY)	Price (NC)
Doggett	Kinzing (IL)	Price, Tom
Dold	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
	Kline	Rangel

Ratcliffe	Scott, David	Van Hollen
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Vargas
Reichert	Serrano	Veasey
Renacci	Sessions	Vela
Ribble	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Rice (SC)	Sherman	Wagner
Rigell	Shinkus	Walberg
Roby	Shuster	Walden
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walker
Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Walorski
Rohrabacher	Sires	Walters, Mimi
Rokita	Slaughter	Walz
Rooney (FL)	Smith (MO)	Wasserman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Ross	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Rothfus	Smith (WA)	Welch
Rouzer	Stefanik	Wenstrup
Roybal-Allard	Stewart	Westerman
Royce	Stivers	Westmoreland
Ruiz	Stutzman	Whitfield
Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)	Williams
Russell	Takai	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (OH)	Takano	Wittman
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)	Womack
Salmon	Thornberry	Woodall
Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi	Yarmuth
Sanford	Tipton	Yoder
Sarbanes	Titus	Yoho
Scalise	Tonko	Young (AK)
Schakowsky	Torres	Young (IA)
Schiff	Trott	Young (IN)
Schock	Tsongas	Zeldin
Schweikert	Turner	Zinke
Scott (VA)	Upton	
Scott, Austin	Valadao	

NOES—20

Clarke (NY)	Jones	Schrader
Ellison	Kaptur	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hastings	Pocan	Waters, Maxine
Hoyer	Richmond	Watson Coleman
Johnson, E. B.	Rush	

NOT VOTING—11

Byrne	Long	Sánchez, Linda
Costa	McNerney	T.
Hinojosa	Rice (NY)	Speier
Lee	Roe (TN)	Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1552

Ms. BASS changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 84, "yea" on rollcall No. 85, "yea" on rollcall No. 86, "yea" on rollcall No. 87, "yea" on rollcall No. 88, "no" on rollcall No. 89, and "yea" on rollcall No. 90.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 124

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Capps and Mr. Polis.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Takano and Mr. Foster.

(3) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Clarke of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 121 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1558

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act. This week, we have an opportunity to advance bold reforms that will strengthen K-12 education for children across America.

A great education can be the great equalizer. It can open doors to unlimited possibilities and provide students

the tools they need to succeed in life. Every child in every school deserves an excellent education, yet, Mr. Chairman, we are failing to provide every child that opportunity.

Today, approximately one out of five students drops out of high school, and many who do graduate are going to college or entering the workforce with a subpar education. The number of students proficient in reading and math is abysmal. The achievement gap separating minority students from their peers is appalling. Parents have little to no options to rescue their children from failing schools.

A broken education system has plagued families for decades. Year after year, policymakers lament the problems and talk about solutions, and once in a while, a law is enacted that promises to improve our education system.

Unfortunately, past efforts have largely failed because they are based on the idea that Washington knows what is best for children. We have doubled down on this approach repeatedly, and it is not working.

Federal mandates dictate how to gauge student achievement, how to define qualified teachers, how to spend money at the State and local levels, and how to improve underperforming schools. And now, thanks to the unprecedented overreach of the current administration, the Department of Education is dictating policies concerning teacher evaluations, academic standards, and more.

No one questions whether parents, teachers, and local education leaders are committed to their students, yet there are some who question whether they are capable of making the best decisions for their students.

Success in school should be determined by those who teach inside our classrooms, by administrators who understand the challenges facing their communities, by parents who know better than anyone the needs of their children. If every child is going to receive a quality education, then we need to place less faith—less faith—in the Secretary of Education and more faith in parents, teachers, and State and local leaders. That is why I am a proud sponsor of the Student Success Act.

By reducing the Federal footprint, restoring local control, and empowering parents and education leaders, this commonsense bill will move our country in a better direction.

□ 1600

The Student Success Act provides States and school districts more flexibility to fund local priorities, not Washington's priorities. The legislation eliminates dozens of ineffective or duplicative programs so that each dollar makes a direct, meaningful, and lasting impact in classrooms. The bill strengthens accountability by replacing the current national scheme with State-led accountability systems, returning to States the responsibility to

measure student performance and improve struggling schools. The Student Success Act also ensures parents have the information they need to hold their schools accountable. It is their tax money, but more importantly, it is their children, and they deserve to know how their schools are performing.

Mr. Chairman, the bill reaffirms that choice is a powerful lifeline for families with children in failing schools by extending the magnet school program, expanding access to high quality charter schools, and allowing Federal funds to follow low-income students to the traditional, public, or public charter school of the parents' choice.

Finally, the Student Success Act reins in the authority of the Secretary of Education. We must stop the Secretary from unilaterally imposing his will on schools, and this bill will do just that. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that is why the White House and powerful special interests are teaming up to defeat this legislation. They fear the bill will lead to less control in Washington and more control in States and school districts. Let me assure the American people: that is precisely what this bill will do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to help all children, regardless of background, income, or ZIP Code, to receive an excellent education by supporting the Student Success Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5, a bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, a landmark civil rights law enacted under President Lyndon B. Johnson. As we approach the 50-year anniversary of its enactment, we cannot take lightly ESEA's mission, goals, and achievements over the course of five decades. It is by that yardstick of history that we must judge H.R. 5 today and determine if it will move our education system closer to meeting the challenges of the 21st century and prepare our students for the global economy.

We all know too well that quality education is even more vital today than it was generations ago. In our rapidly changing economy, our Nation's continued success depends on a well-educated workforce. A competitive and educated workforce strengthens the very social fabric of America: people with higher levels of education are less likely to be unemployed, less likely to need public assistance, less likely to become a teen parent, and less likely to get caught up in the criminal justice system. Over the course of ESEA's history, we have recognized that for many politically disconnected populations, equitable access to an education has not been a reality. It was necessary for the Federal Government to fill in the gaps of funding our public school systems.

Inequality was inevitable when most school systems are funded by real es-

tate taxes, and further by virtue of the fact that in our democratic society, we respond to political pressure. For 50 years, Congress has recognized that low-income students were not getting their fair share of the pie and that supplemental resources were absolutely necessary to ensure that all children had access to quality public education. As a result, Congress has a long-standing policy to target our limited Federal funding to schools and students who get left behind in an unequal system.

Mr. Chairman, one of this bill's most troubling provisions, which strikes at the heart of ESEA's long history of targeting resources to our neediest students, is the so-called portability provision. Now, present law gives greater weight to funding in areas of high concentration of poverty. Under H.R. 5, portability, a State agency could use all of its title I funds to districts based solely on the percentage of poor children, regardless of the concentration of poor people in a district.

As a result, much of the title I support intended towards those areas of concentration of poverty would be re-allocated to those wealthier areas. In other words, the low-income areas would get less, and the wealthy areas would get more. I ask: If that is the solution, then I wonder what you think the problem was? Analysis from a number of organizations, including the Department of Education, demonstrates title I portability will take money from the poorer schools and school districts and give more to affluent districts. This disproportionately affects students of color, and this is just simply wrong.

Data shows that H.R. 5 would provide the largest 33 school districts with the highest concentration of Black and Hispanic students over \$3 billion less in Federal funding than the President's budget over the next 6 years. Furthermore, the Center for American Progress found in its review of portability that districts with high concentrations of poverty could lose an average of \$85 per student, while the more affluent areas would gain more than \$290 per student.

There is an overwhelming body of research that shows that targeting resources to schools and districts with the highest concentrations of poverty is an effective way to mitigate the effects of poverty. Current law reflects this evidence and targets funding to schools where there are greater concentrations of poverty, and this bill rolls the clock back and reverses that.

To add insult to injury, H.R. 5 eliminates what is called maintenance of effort, a requirement of ESEA that States maintain their effort and that the Federal money will supplement what they are doing. As a result of this bill, States could use their education funds to fund tax cuts or other noneducation initiatives, thus turning ESEA into a glorified slush fund where politics would drive funding allocations.

And we know who is going to lose when politics are at play—our children.

There are other flaws with H.R. 5. This bill sets no standards for college or career readiness and allows students with disabilities to be taught with lesser standards. It limits our investment in education over the next 6 years because there are no adjustments for inflation. It block grants important programs, diluting the purpose and the outcome. Taken as a whole, these policies will have a disproportionate impact on students of color, students with disabilities, and our English language learners. It is no wonder that business groups, labor groups, civil rights, disabilities, and education groups have all expressed deep concerns about this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 5, as it will turn the clock back on American public education. In its current form, the bill abandons the fundamental principles of equity and accountability in our education system, it eviscerates education funding, it fails to support our educators, and it leaves our children ill-prepared for success in the classroom and beyond. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, it is now my great pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his great leadership on this bill and in the committee generally.

I rise in strong support this afternoon because every student, Mr. Chairman, every student deserves an effective teacher, an engaging classroom, and a quality education that paves the path for a bright and prosperous future. That is what we all want. Unfortunately, despite the best of intentions, the Nation's current K-12 education law has failed to provide students this fundamental right. In fact, the law has only gotten in the way.

Far from taking us back to the past, this bill will take us to the future, where we should have been for a while now in terms of education, so that we can maintain competitiveness with the rest of the world and win in the 21st century.

No Child Left Behind's onerous requirements and the Obama administration's waiver scheme and pet projects have created a one-size-fits-all system that hinders innovation and stymies local efforts to improve student learning. As a result, too many young adults leave high school today without basic knowledge in reading, math, and science. They are ill-equipped to complete college and compete in the workforce, and consequently they are deprived of one of the best opportunities they have to earn a lifetime of success. We shouldn't shackle any student to that kind of future.

Americans have settled for the status quo for far too long, and today we have an opportunity to chart the new course. The Student Success Act departs from the top-down approach that has inefficiently and ineffectively governed elementary and secondary education and restores that responsibility to its rightful stewards: parents, teachers, State and local education leaders, and the local taxpayers.

First, the bill gets the Federal government out of the business of running our schools. It eliminates the dizzying maze of Federal mandates that has dictated local decisions and downsizes the bloated bureaucracy at the Department of Education that has focused on what Washington wants rather than what students need. The whole theme of this bill is that we trust teachers, parents, local education officials, and our local taxpayers much more than we would ever trust a Federal bureaucrat.

Mr. Chairman, I find it funny that the other side, those who are against this bill, actually cite the Department of Education in arguing what a bad bill this is. Imagine a Federal bureaucrat actually arguing to devolve its power back to its rightful owners. Of course they are going to be for the status quo. They benefit from the status quo. The students do not.

Second, the bill empowers parents and education leaders with choice, transparency, and flexibility. It ensures parents continue to have the information they need to hold schools accountable and helps more families escape underperforming schools by expanding alternative education options such as quality charter schools. It also provides States the flexibility to develop their own systems for addressing school performance and the autonomy to use Federal funds in the most efficient way.

This bill respects, Mr. Chairman, that it is the people's property. It is their tax dollars. We shouldn't be forcing any kind of maintenance of effort requirement on States or local jurisdictions. It is their decision to decide what to do with their money.

With the Student Success Act, we have an opportunity to overcome the failed status quo of high stakes testing and Federal waivers. We have an opportunity to reduce the Federal footprint in our Nation's classrooms. We also have an opportunity to signal to moms, dads, teachers, administrators, and State officials that we trust them to hold schools accountable for delivering a quality education to every child.

As my good friend, former colleague and fellow Hoosier Governor Mike Pence, said before the House Education and the Workforce Committee earlier this month:

There is nothing that ails education that can't be fixed by giving parents more choices and teachers more freedom to teach.

That is exactly what this bill does. This bill fosters an environment to accomplish that very thing. So I urge my colleagues to join me in replacing a

broken law with much-needed, commonsense education reforms and ask you to vote "yes"—"yes"—on the Student Success Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is overwhelming bipartisan consensus that we need to replace No Child Left Behind. And there is overwhelming bipartisan consensus that a rewrite of No Child Left Behind should promote local flexibility and support schools, not punish them. So I am deeply disappointed that the House has not come together to produce a bipartisan bill.

Despite a common goal and a long history of setting aside differences to work together on this important legislation, this bill does not adequately support America's students. Unfortunately, the Student Success Act shifts resources away from communities where poverty is most concentrated and freezes funding for America's most needy students at a time when public school enrollment is on the rise and more than half the students come from low-income families.

H.R. 5 does not support a well-rounded education for all students, it does not ensure college- and career-ready standards for all students, it does not promote quality afterschool programs, and it does not do enough to reduce emphasis on high-stakes tests.

The original goal of ESEA was laudable—equity. ESEA deserves a full review by the House so we can implement thoughtful solutions that reflect the current needs in our schools. But this bill does not protect historically underserved students.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this act, and I ask my colleagues to do the same. We need a law that is serious about addressing the challenges educators and students face today.

□ 1615

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), who has been active in this bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask, if I could, for the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee to engage in a colloquy with me concerning the importance of ensuring the Federal Government does not interfere with States' rights over public education.

Mr. KLINE. I, as the chairman of the full committee, would be happy to engage in that colloquy.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no constitutional role for the Federal Government in education.

However, I understand that the funds under this act are accepted voluntarily by each State, but I am concerned that State bureaucrats often simply accept

these funds and all the strings without any input from our constituents or locally elected officials. I saw this in the Texas House.

I very much appreciate that the gentleman from Indiana and Chairman KLINE worked with me to protect the 10th Amendment and to ensure that States knowingly accept the strings attached to these programs before they receive any funding under this bill.

I want to be clear that this provision simply ensures that locally elected officials, parents, and other interested stakeholders have the opportunity to stand up and voice concern or support for accepting Federal funding at their State capital before any unelected, unaccountable bureaucrat can accept that money and all the strings that come with them.

I want to ask if the chairman concurs that this is the intent and the result of the language that you have included in the Student Success Act?

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me thank my colleague from Texas for his leadership on this important issue. I understand and appreciate your concern about this Federal role in education policy.

That is why we were happy to include your amendment in the underlying bill. It made the bill stronger and gave another tool to parents and local officials to protect their rights when it comes to educating our children.

This amendment, in combination with other strong provisions to rein in the Secretary, including an absolute ban on his ability to force any State to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other particular standards, ensures the Federal Government cannot dictate what is taught in schools, what assessments are given, or what standards are used.

In fact, this amendment ensures States willfully accept the limited requirements that will come with these funds and reaffirms what decisions should be left to the States.

I thank the gentleman for offering this provision and his commitment to a limited Federal role in education, and I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for protecting the 10th Amendment rights of the States to control their public school system and affirming a parents' right to control their child's education.

I appreciate you confirming the intent of this amendment. It will mean a far greater role for States and parents in their child's education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hate to throw cold water on the last colloquy, but I think it is important to note as we debate this bill, which never had the benefit of a public hearing or a

single subcommittee hearing, is that the Federal mandate for annual testing does not change as a result of this law.

What does change regarding that testing requirement is that the dedicated funding stream, which Congress at least had the decency to pass back in 2002, that is eliminated.

What you are doing is you are maintaining a mandate and you are eliminating the funding to pay for that mandate for testing. What we are ending up with, for all the talk about reducing the Federal footprint, is that we are doubling down on the Federal requirement that States have to have annual testing in schools, which every Member in this Chamber has heard about in loud protest over the last 13 years.

What this shows is that when the process is broken—and it was broken in this case, no committee-subcommittee meetings, no hearings, rushing it to the floor on a hyperpartisan basis, not one single Democratic amendment was accepted at the committee during markup, that is what you end up with, is a deformed bill, which should be defeated.

I urge in the strongest terms possible a “no” vote. Let’s go back and do this the right way.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Just to address a notion of what is done in secret and what is not done in secret and whether or not people have had a chance to weigh in on this legislation, as my friend knows—and I do thank him for not mentioning basketball, by the way—as my friend knows, this bill has had multiple hearings over several years.

It has been debated in committee. It has been debated on the floor of the House. It has been debated in the media. It is much discussed and much known—in contrast to the bill, the amendment, a substitute that my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle brought forward in committee, 851 pages, that nobody had seen outside the Democrat Caucus, so I believe this bill is well known, and it is the right direction to move us forward into the future to make sure that all of our children receive the quality education they deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond to the idea that our substitute was produced.

I would apologize to the gentleman for having sprung the substitute on him.

However, 2 legislative days after his bill was introduced, he scheduled a markup on the bill, so we produced a response to his bill in 2 legislative days. That is all the time we were allowed.

We would have allowed hearings. We would have liked hearings on his bill and our bill, but that just wasn’t to take place because of the rush to judgment.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), the ranking member of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act reaffirmed the Supreme Court’s decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* that every child has the right to an equal educational opportunity. H.R. 5 undermines the law’s original intent, turning back the clock on equity and accountability in American public education.

As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of ESEA, Republicans have chosen to honor the anniversary by bringing a partisan bill to the House floor that tears apart the historic Federal role in education.

H.R. 5 should be known as the “Ensure Students Don’t Succeed Act.” The bill is a backward leap in our country’s education system, not a forward one.

Every student in America has a right to a quality education. It is our job as Members of Congress to make sure that right is protected, something that H.R. 5 does not do.

I refuse to fail our children and their families because our children deserve so much more than this legislation provides.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am very, very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the current K–12 education system is failing our students, and State and local attempts to make it better have been hampered by an enormous Federal footprint.

Parents and education leaders have lost much of their decisionmaking authority to Washington bureaucrats, and the Secretary of Education has bullied States into adopting the Obama administration’s pet projects.

Unsurprisingly, student achievement levels remain worrisome. Just 36 percent of eighth grade students read at grade level, and only 35 percent are proficient in math.

For far too long, our schools have been governed by a top-down approach that stymies State and local efforts to meet the unique needs of their student populations. We can’t continue to make the same mistakes and expect better results. America’s students deserve change.

Fortunately, this week, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to chart a new course with the Student Success Act, legislation that reduces the Federal footprint in the Nation’s classrooms and restores control to the people who know their students best: parents, teachers, and local leaders.

The Student Success Act gets Washington out of the business of running

schools. It protects State and local autonomy by prohibiting the Secretary of Education from coercing States into adopting Common Core or other standards or assessments and by preventing the Secretary from creating additional burdens on States and school districts.

The bill reduces the size of the Federal education bureaucracy. Currently, the Department of Education oversees more than 80 programs geared towards primary and secondary education, most of which are duplicative and fail to deliver adequate results for students. The bill eliminates over 65 of these programs and requires the Secretary of Education to reduce the Department’s workforce accordingly.

The Student Success Act repeals onerous, one-size-fits-all mandates that dictate accountability, teacher quality, and local spending that have done more to tie up States and school districts in red tape than to support education efforts. It returns responsibility for classroom decisions to parents, teachers, administrators, and education officials.

The bill also provides States and school districts the funding flexibility to efficiently and effectively invest limited taxpayer dollars to boost student achievement by creating a local academic flexible grant. It provides the public with greater transparency and accountability over the development of new rules affecting K–12 schools.

Education is a deeply personal issue. After years of the Secretary of Education running schools through executive fiat, we understand that people are concerned about what a new K–12 education law will do.

That is why a number of key principles have guided our efforts to replace the law since we began the process more than 4 years ago: reducing the Federal footprint, restoring local control, and empowering parents and education leaders.

Those principles are reflected throughout the legislation, including specific safeguards that protect the right of States to opt out of the law, as well as the autonomy of home schools, religious schools, and private schools.

Organizations such as the Council for American Private Education, the Home School Legal Defense Association, and Committee on Catholic Education of U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops have expressed support for the Student Success Act because they know it will keep the Federal Government out of their business and preserve their cherished rights.

A host of administration bureaucrats is attempting to defeat these much-needed changes. They know each reform that returns flexibility and choice to parents and school boards represent a loss of power in D.C.

It is time we put the interests of America’s students above the desires of Washington politicians.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. FOXX. By reversing the top-down policies of recent decades, the Student Success Act offers conservative solutions to repair a broken education system.

It would finally get Washington out of the way and allow parents, teachers, and State and local education leaders the flexibility to provide every child in every school a high-quality education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

I have to ask the majority: When did local control come to mean spend Federal dollars but ditch the Federal oversight?

During our markup last week—and I certainly heard today Member after Member arguing how removing Federal standards would help local leaders make tough decisions. This is absolutely backwards.

For 9 years, I served on the second largest school board in California, the sixth in the Nation, and I distinctly remember every school in the district making a compelling case for extra resources.

Which is why, frankly, we should be debating how to increase the size of the pie that goes to education, rather than only arguing on how to cut it up.

I still remember particularly one board meeting agonizing over the decision to move money from one needy school to another. We had to cut our budget, and we had to make a decision. In the end, the law and the safeguards around title I helped direct us to make sure the money went to the students that needed it most.

Ultimately, the direction in the law helps us balance competing needs, and I urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

□ 1630

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5, also known as the Student Success Act. Having spent 24 years as a classroom teacher, I am especially concerned about the title I funding mechanism in this legislation. We have seen time and time again that block grants often redirect funding away from intended populations and are a prelude to further cuts.

I also oppose the Republican bill's portability provision, which betrays the original intent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. ESEA is meant to promote equitable opportunity and education for all and to help raise the academic achievement of low-income children. This legislation will do the opposite.

Finally, I object to the utter lack of Federal accountability in H.R. 5. While I oppose the current test-driven, high-stakes accountability system, I want the right accountability system, not no accountability system.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation goes too far. It cuts too deep and takes too many steps backward. I oppose H.R. 5. I call on my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to address this issue of grants and block grants and so forth we are starting to hear a little bit about.

I have been hearing for years, as I talk to superintendents in Minnesota and around the country, their frustration with the maze of Federal programs, 80-some Federal programs, each with its soda straw of funding and requirements for action and reporting. They have told me again and again: I have got money here, and I don't need it there. I need money here, and I can't move that money. I don't have the flexibility to move that money. I need to be able to put the resources where my students need it.

So, by eliminating 65 of those soda straws of individual controls and giving that flexibility to superintendents, we allow the money to be spent where it is needed the most. I think that is one of the great strengths of this bill, and it is one of the reasons why the American Association of School Superintendents does support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Chairman, this bill breaks the promise made 50 years ago to help all kids get a good, quality public education and to recognize the challenges faced by kids living in poverty.

When talking about the problems with this Republican bill, one wonders where to start. Is it the tearing apart of public education that comes in the form of dismantling title I funding? or the fact that the portability scheme is a slippery slope to turning our public school system into one big taxpayer-funded voucher program with public dollars sent to private schools? or the fact that Republicans have failed to address the need for early education or the maintenance of efforts of education? or that this bill diminishes the focus on professional development for teachers or the clear protections for collective bargaining agreements that are already part of State laws? or, ultimately, that this bill provides insufficient funding lower than what the title I authorization for last year authorized under the current law?

This bill doesn't provide real student success, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KLINE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a member of the committee.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed 50 years ago to embody the promise that education is a right, not a privilege. We are supposed to be guardians of that promise, not the architects of its demise.

This reauthorization was an opportunity for Congress to delve in and debate the most pressing issues facing our schools. Sadly, the Republican majority chose to introduce a partisan bill behind closed doors without a single public hearing. Now we have a bill that reflects that lack of inclusion, takes hundreds of millions of dollars from our most vulnerable children, and weakens the safeguards that govern taxpayer money.

When I served on my local school committee, a tough economy meant some really difficult decisions. Not everyone was happy, but we listened. We listened to teachers, administrators, parents, students, experts, and fiscal watchdogs, and we were guided by one simple principle: what is best for our students. It is a shame Congress couldn't find the will to do the same.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 5.

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a former college professor and now a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5.

Two weeks ago, our committee came together expecting to seriously consider this bill, but instead Republicans said "no": "no" to moving beyond the status quo, "no" to investing in the futures of our kids, "no" to supporting our teachers and principals, and "no" to ensuring the success of our neediest students.

Guess what. You said "yes" to taking money from our poorest students like Robin Hood in reverse, "yes" to erasing the gains we have made over the past 50 years, and "yes" to denying students success. This bill ignores the obvious needs of our students and turns its back on some of our most vulnerable.

I hope we are not fooled by the name of the bill. Student Success is a failure. It clearly sets up our students to fail. H.R. 5 fails on all accounts. It fails our neediest students. It fails to invest in our teachers and our principals. It fails to prepare students for college and careers. This bill deserves an F.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, could you advise how much time is available to both parties?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a former mayor.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is our responsibility to provide America's young people with every opportunity to obtain a world-class education in the best possible environment so they can compete in an increasingly global economy. That is why it is critical that we reauthorize ESEA the right way. Schools and educators deserve certainty, continuity, and direction based on new research and informed by our experience from the last decade, and students deserve the best education we can provide. H.R. 5 is not the right way to do it.

H.R. 5 would freeze funding at current levels for 6 years, representing over \$800 million in cuts compared to presequester funding. By funding programs with block grants and introducing title I portability, this fails to support greater achievement of low-income students, students of color, students with disabilities, and English language learners. This fails students in so many ways.

We should be working together to ensure that a reauthorized ESEA improves student achievement, supports teachers and principals, and provides high-quality education for all students. This bill does not accomplish this.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Upon signing the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act, President Johnson described education as "the only valid passport from poverty." This bill threatens to tear up that passport. It caps Federal education funding at 2015 levels, levels which are already woefully inadequate after years of drastic cuts, and makes no provision for inflation, let alone the growing need for Federal education programs.

The bill allows States to direct Federal dollars away from schools in districts with the greatest poverty. It permits States to reduce education funding with no accountability. It allows schools in wealthier neighborhoods to use title I funding without having to target funds to the students with the greatest needs. It is a blatant betrayal of the ESEA's fundamental purpose, which is to level the playing field for low-income kids.

It weakens or eliminates many successful programs, including 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative, which provides quality after school, summer school programs for disadvantaged children.

Mr. Chairman, it used to be that hard work in schools and on the job was the surest ticket to the middle class. Today, that compact is broken. Millions of hardworking families do not earn enough to make ends meet, let alone move up in the world. The cuts proposed in this bill would make matters even worse. Kids from poor neighborhoods are already being neglected, while those from wealthy areas get an ever-increasing slice of the pie. These disparities reverberate throughout their lives to create an increasingly divided, unequal society.

Let me put it simply: Without broad access to quality education, there is no future for the middle class. With this legislation, the majority is saying to America's low-income kids: You are on your own.

Mr. Chairman, that is not who we are. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), a new member of the committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, because our system, education system, is failing. Where I come from, we call trying to do things over and over again and expecting a different outcome insanity. I believe our system is broken to the extent that it is a moral imperative for Congress, at this point, to step up and act. Our students, our parents, our teachers should not have to settle for a failing system.

Before Congress, I worked in the private sector, and I also had an opportunity to work in State government, including the opportunity to serve as the majority leader of the Michigan Senate. At that time, I saw firsthand how much more effective we can be at the State level to use State resources and control where they are going than to have the Federal Government come in, step in and use, and expect the State to spend it in a certain way.

This system of top-down does not help the States; it puts us in a bad position. As a State legislator, had I the opportunity, I would have come here and supported the cause as well because it is the right thing to do. I do believe it is high time that we defend the 10th Amendment and rein back the Federal Government's role, especially in our children's education. Local teachers and parents know our children better than the Department of Education in Washington, D.C., ever could; and the result is that our system is broken, and that becomes clearer and clearer every day.

I just want to mention a couple statistics that I find alarming but instruc-

tive. First of all, 35 percent of our fourth graders are reading at a proficient level. Only 26 percent of our high school seniors are proficient in math. Just a couple examples that I mention. Those examples are unacceptable.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. The Student Success Act gives authority back to our States and expands opportunities so our children can get the best education opportunity possible. That is what they deserve, and that is what I was sent to Washington, D.C., to support.

This bill is also critical in ensuring the Federal Government cannot force a failed program like Common Core on the States. When looking at education reform, it is also important to make sure that we continue to protect the rights of our home schoolers and our private schools. That is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, we must reduce the Federal Government's footprint in our children's classrooms because it is making a mess of the education system. We are long overdue for change, and I believe the Student Success Act will move our Nation in the right direction.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, because this bill limits the amount of funding available, it moves money from low-income areas to wealthy areas, eliminates targeted funds for English learners and those with disabilities; it fails to set meaningful standards.

A lot of organizations oppose the legislation, including business organizations, child advocacy groups, civil rights groups, the organizations supporting those with disabilities and health groups, including the Congressional Tri-Caucus; the Advocacy Institute; the Afterschool Alliance; the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; the American Association of People With Disabilities; the American Association of University Women; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Foundation for the Blind; the Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Autism National Committee; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; the Center for American Progress; the Center for Law and Social Policy; the Children's Defense Fund; the Committee for Education Funding; the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities; the Council of the Great City Schools; the Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Inc.; Democrats for Education Reform; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Easter Seals; Education Post; Education Law Center; First Focus Campaign for Children; Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network; Human Rights Campaign; the Bazelon Center

for Mental Health Law; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Leading Educators; the League of United Latin American Citizens; the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the NAACP; the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the National Association of School Psychologists; the National Center for Learning Disabilities; the National Council on Independent Living; the National Council on Teacher Quality; the National Center on Time & Learning; the National Congress of American Indians; the National Council of La Raza; the National Coalition for Public Education; the National Disability Rights Network; the National Down Syndrome Congress; the National Education Association; the National Urban League; the National Women's Law Center; Partners for Each and Every Child; the Poverty & Race Research Action Council; Public Advocates Inc.; Stand for Children; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; TASH; Teach Plus; TNTP; the Education Trust; the United Negro College Fund; the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They are all in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I often don't come to the floor to speak, but I felt compelled on this particular bill, H.R. 5, to talk about it. Why? Because I represent a district that has 90 percent of the public schoolchildren who live and receive reduced or free lunches and it is important for me to just state for the record that I think that a bill that takes away funding from public schools—targeted funding for low-income and poverty students—would be an abomination.

This bill is here because of the work of Lyndon Johnson 50 years ago. It was a civil rights bill, frankly. Why? It was an acknowledgment that socially disadvantaged children needed additional help. Somewhere along the line, Mr. Chairman, we have lost as a nation the notion of "our children."

It is always "my child," not "our children."

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Until the parents of more affluent children see that their lives are intrinsically linked to children who are poor, we as a nation will never be the beloved community that so many civil rights leaders fought and died for.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for the opportunity to speak on this underlying bill, and I want to

urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a member of the committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his work on this bill. It is a very important bill, and it is certainly very applicable to what is going on in our country right now.

Mr. Chairman, Federal intervention in our Nation's classrooms is at an all-time high, and the Obama administration continues to believe that they think they know what is best for our children. However, despite the continued intrusion into our children's classrooms, student achievement remains stagnant.

Out of 34 countries, students in the U.S. rank 20th and 27th in science and math respectively, so it is clear that our education system is not adequately serving our children, and it is not going to be fixed by Washington bureaucrats. Our education system can only be fixed by parents, teachers, aunts, uncles, coaches, and community leaders—the people who actually know what is best for our Nation's children.

That is why I am supporting H.R. 5. I am supporting this bill to put some restraints on the administration, to rein in the Department of Education, and to put the keys to our children's educations and futures back in local control where it belongs.

It repeals out-of-touch teacher qualification programs, and it allows State and local officials to determine who is qualified to teach their children. It also eliminates 65 programs and creates a grant program with greater flexibility for school districts.

We all know that children learn differently and at their own pace, and without this bill, the Secretary of Education can prohibit funds from being sent to States unless they adopt certain one-size-fits-all standards, like Common Core.

I will be the first one to say that additional reforms to our education system are needed. No, this is not the silver bullet, but it is a great start, and it is a great bill. I support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to state for the record that graduation rates have been up since No Child Left Behind was passed. Black and Latino children are doing better, so it has been working, but we need to continue to improve.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the Statement of Administration Policy, which speaks to the administration position on H.R. 5. The Statement of Administration Policy goes as follows:

The administration strongly opposes H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, as approved by the House Committee on Education and the

Workforce. Congress must act in a bipartisan way to reform the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to help States prepare all children for college and careers by giving them flexibility from No Child Left Behind mandates. However, H.R. 5 represents a significant step backwards in the efforts to help all of the Nation's children and their families prepare for their futures.

H.R. 5 abdicates the historic Federal role in elementary and secondary education of ensuring the educational progress of all of America's children, including children from low-income families, students with disabilities, English learners, and students of color. It fails to maintain the core expectation that States and school districts will take serious, sustained, and targeted actions when necessary to remedy achievement gaps and reform persistently low-performing schools. H.R. 5 fails to identify opportunity gaps or remedy inequities in access to the resources and supports students need to succeed, such as challenging academic courses, excellent teachers and principals, afterschool enrichment or expanded learning time, and other academic and nonacademic supports.

Rather than investing more in schools, H.R. 5 would allow States to divert education funding away from the schools and students who need it the most through the so-called "portability" provision. The bill's caps on Federal education spending would lock in recent budget cuts for the rest of the decade, and the bill would allow funds currently required to be used for education to be used for other purposes, such as spending on sports stadiums or tax cuts for the wealthy. H.R. 5 fails to make critical investments for the Nation's students, including high-quality preschool for America's children, support for America's teachers and principals, and investment in innovative solutions for the public education system.

The administration agrees on the need for high-quality statewide annual testing as required in H.R. 5, so parents and teachers know how children and schools are doing from year to year and to allow for consistent measurement of school and student performance across the State. However, this bill should do more to reduce redundant and unnecessary testing, such as asking States to limit the amount of time spent on standardized testing and requiring parental notification when testing is consuming too much classroom learning time.

The administration opposes H.R. 5 in its current form for all of these reasons but particularly because it would deny Federal funds to the classrooms that need them the most and fails to assure parents that policymakers and educators will take action when students are not learning.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, since No Child Left Behind was put in place, the Federal Government has dictated how States and school districts spend money, gauge student learning and school performance, and hire classroom teachers.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it isn't working. Washington bureaucrats, no matter how well meaning they are, will never have the personal understanding

of the diverse and special and unique needs of students than the teachers, administrators, and parents who spend time with them.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here today because I have to speak for Erin and Moses. Erin is my daughter-in-law and the mother of my four grandchildren. Moses was a student who tested her teaching ability and her passion for teaching.

Erin came to teach in a fourth and fifth grade classroom for special needs students in Cicero, Illinois. Freshly minted out of her educational training and master's program, she came in with a passion for teaching.

She came in because she was sent in that classroom as a full-time, continuing substitute because the teacher of that classroom had gotten up one day, had walked out of the classroom, and had never come back.

Erin was given the opportunity of a lifetime of teaching these students, and she began to invest her life into those students, especially in one young student, a fourth grader by the name of Moses.

Moses came from a difficult situation. Moses at that time in the fourth grade was not even fully potty-trained, but Erin invested her time and talent and, frankly, her treasure in the life of that student, as well as of the others. She had a wonderful outcome in working with the parent in the home, as well as with Moses in the classroom.

The next year, Erin was given the opportunity to be a full-time teacher, not a sub anymore. I will never forget the day when Erin came to me, with tears in her eyes, and said: "Dad, I'm not sure I'm cut out for teaching."

I said: "Erin, why? You had an amazing impact for that 6 months of time you spent in the same classroom last year."

She said: "Now, all I'm doing is filling out paperwork for Illinois, for Chicago, and for the Federal Government."

She ultimately had our twin grandsons and went from the classroom to the home, but there will be a day that comes when those four kids are at the stage when she can go back to the classroom. I want Erin to go back and have the ability to teach, to love on those kids, to direct them, to work with the parents, and not spend time filling out bureaucratic forms.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I support the Student Success Act. It replaces Federal control with State and local control.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. WALBERG. The bill allows States to establish and implement their own standards and assessments. The bill allows States to develop their own accountability plans for improving underperforming schools by eliminating federally prescribed school improvement and turnaround interven-

tions. The bill provides State and local school districts flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we are speaking for. It is for the Erins and for the Moseses of the world—educational opportunities that should lead us into the future in great ways for this country and to lead the world.

□ 1700

This is what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. The Student Success Act places control back in the hands of education's rightful stewards: the teachers, the administrators, the States, the parents, and, ultimately, the students.

Let's pass this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ABRAHAM). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Consortium for Citizens With Disabilities says:

The Student Success Act does not fully support students with disabilities, and in fact, it creates incentives for schools and districts to take students with disabilities, unchecked, off the track from having equitable access to and achieving a regular high school diploma.

Incidence data reflects that less than 1 percent of all students have the significant cognitive disabilities, which corresponds to about 10 percent of students with disabilities.

Without this limitation, we fear that schools may inappropriately assign students to the alternative assessment. Data show assignment to these alternative assessments may lead to reduced access to the general curriculum and limit a student's access to earn a regular diploma.

That is why the disability groups oppose the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to end with a reminder that this limits the funding. It transfers money from low-income areas to high-income areas. That is not just urban areas. There are over 2,400 low-income rural districts that will lose about \$150 million, or 15 percent, of their total allocation, under the current law. The legislation eliminates targeting for English learners and those with disabilities. Finally, it fails to set meaningful standards.

For those reasons, we should join the administration in opposing H.R. 5, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As is always the case in these debates on the floor, we hear a lot of things. Some of them are actually factual; some of them are not. There is, shockingly, some hyperbole that comes along with this.

We did hear some things, though, from both sides of the aisle that I think are worth underscoring. One of the speakers on the other side of the aisle talked about how schools and States need continuity—I think was

his word—predictability. That is exactly what we do not have now.

Right now, this country is operating under the law of the land, which is No Child Left Behind, and under a big, convoluted scheme of temporary conditional waivers which provide no continuity, no predictability, and that is why we are hearing on both sides of the aisle—from coast-to-coast and off the coast, as a matter of fact—that we need to replace No Child Left Behind.

I believe that as we replace No Child Left Behind, we need to put responsibility in the hands of parents and teachers and school boards and States, and not in the hands of Washington, D.C.

I think that it is not fair to say that there is not a problem. We heard from the ranking member that graduation rates have gone up. On the other hand, they haven't gone up much, and we are still in a position where a fourth, or 26 percent, of high school seniors are proficient in math. That means 74 percent—maybe I need to have a little math here—are not. Only 38 percent of those high school seniors can read at grade level. We have a problem with one in five students dropping out. We need to address that problem.

We heard a lot of talk about where title I funds go and portability to public schools. It is a question, I understand. There is a disagreement here, but we happen to believe it is fair that if you are a poor kid, if you are eligible for title I funds, you ought to get those funds. There is a disagreement. I think the children, if they are eligible, if they are in poverty, ought to get their share of title I funds.

One of the things we didn't talk much about today as we talked about the problems out there, we know that in some areas of the country you have children trapped in absolutely failing schools where less than half of the kids graduate and those that graduate are nowhere near ready to go to college or go to work.

So we have seen across the country and in most States public charter schools popping up, giving parents hope, giving them a chance to get those kids out of failing schools.

I said this the other day in the Rules Committee, because it was so moving to me. I went to a charter school in north Minneapolis. There were 430 kids in that school. Their parents are delighted with the education they are getting now and thrilled to get their kids out of failing schools.

When I asked the principal and the founder of the school if she could take more kids, she said: No, this is the right size for this school. She would like to replicate the school—and that is what this bill allows—so she can have another successful charter school. And how successful is it? There are a thousand kids, Mr. Chairman, on the waiting list to get in that charter school because their parents want to get out of a failing school system. This bill allows that to happen.

It comes down to, fundamentally: Who do you trust, Washington or local government? We want to put the control in the hands of parents and local school boards and States.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 5, the ill-named Student Success Act. H.R. 5 would undermine significant gains made by No Child Left Behind, and eviscerate the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by dismantling its foundation of equity and accountability.

Under this bill, school districts with the highest concentrations of Hispanic students would lose more than \$1.9 billion in federal funding. Los Angeles Unified School District which is more than 74 percent Hispanic faces the largest cut in Title I funds, over \$80 million, which amounts to nearly 25 percent of their budget.

School districts with a high concentration of students living in poverty could lose \$700 million in funding and high-poverty districts could see cuts as large as 74 percent. The portability of Title I funds would divert and dilute limited funds from schools with high needs and high concentrations of poverty. This undermines the fundamental purpose of Title I: to assist high needs and high poverty schools. With 35 percent of Latino children under the age of five living in poverty, this is the time to increase, not decrease funding.

Education is our nation's great equalizer. I would not be where I am today if it were not for the quality public education I received. For over 50 years, ESEA has been our nation's driving force for educational equity. Unfortunately, this Republican bill would dismantle the foundation of equality and accountability that ESEA has built over the last half-century. If we want our nation to remain a leader in the world, we must improve equal access to quality education for the next generation. Our students are the future of tomorrow, and we simply cannot let them down.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. ABRAHAM, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS WEEK

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Eating Disorders Awareness Week. This time is dedicated to educating parents and children about the causes and serious

health conditions and consequences of eating disorders.

Eating disorders affect more than 14 million Americans and have disproportionate impacts on teens and young adults. Beyond genetic links, factors such as consistent exposure to misleading advertising that distort one's own body image can lead to eating disorders. The key to containing this growing health issue is to spread awareness and promote authentic, healthy body images.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, along with a bipartisan coalition, we have urged the Federal Trade Commission to uphold their duty to protect American consumers by working with health professionals and the advertising industry to promote fair and responsible advertisements, especially for products geared for children and teens.

If you suspect that your child has an eating disorder, please seek professional help. There are many local resources available to families.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL BROADCASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ABRAHAM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extends their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of today's Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much this opportunity that we have this evening to inform and to educate my colleagues in the House, fellow Members of Congress, and even the American people through C-SPAN, about the importance of local radio and television broadcasters. They are important not only to our country, but I want to talk about how important they are to our communities—the communities we live in, the communities they live in, the communities they work in.

For decades, these broadcasters have been the first ones to respond to disasters and emergencies. They have saved numerous lives by their ability to be on the scene and to broadcast widely. They have helped communities pick up the pieces after a natural disaster or a manmade disaster. The broadcasters of our country, of our communities, have played a vital role in the quality of life in our communities.

I have been blessed throughout my career not just in public service but in other positions to work with local broadcasters hosting telethons to help find cures for diseases like muscular dystrophy, cancer, and many other diseases that our communities have tackled together.

Now, we need to remember that these radio and television stations are not monolithic corporations. They are owned and run and managed by our friends and neighbors, the people that we see every day.

Today is a big day. It is an appropriate day to celebrate—not just inform and educate but celebrate—the role of America's broadcasters in our communities. Because today, hundreds of Members of Congress were able to meet with their local television and radio station personalities and managers and representatives. Today, nearly 600 broadcasters came to Capitol Hill to tell their story of public service and to remind their Representatives of their role.

You may not know that these broadcasters are required by statute to serve the public interest. When I hear about the stories they cover, when I see the types of stories they cover, the lives they have touched, the service that they are providing, I am heartened to know that we have a vibrant, thriving system of local broadcasting in this country.

Unlike many other countries around the world, where national and regional news is what is available to their citizens, here in the United States, here in places like North Dakota and Texas and Arkansas and others, we have a system of local radio and TV stations so folks living in the same community are bound together by weather events, sporting events, news of the day, and human interest, all provided by an accurate local source.

I know in North Dakota we have seen weather emergencies where information from our local broadcasters was all that was available for those suffering the impacts of a storm. Several years ago, I myself, with my family, in 1984, spent all night—this was before cell phones, I know—spent all night in a car in a blizzard that came upon North Dakota suddenly. We were just off the interstate. The only communication we had was through KFGO Radio, which won a Peabody that year for broadcasting to us and to several others that were stranded in that storm.

So, today, we are going to hear a number of stories from Members of Congress across the country also touched by their local TV and radio stations. I thank them for sharing stories about their local stations. I will share some of mine as we go throughout this Special Order, but I want to call on somebody who knows a fair bit about broadcasting, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. CRAMER, I appreciate the opportunity. It is an honor to be able to stand up and advocate on behalf of our broadcasters, who are not only my constituents and your constituents, but my colleagues, because I am, as you mentioned, a former broadcaster, and I know firsthand the importance of broadcasting, as you indicated, to local and national communities.

You talked about a weather occurrence. Last week, my district and most of Arkansas was blanketed with ice.

□ 1715

I can tell you with certainty that a good number of my constituents were tuned in to their local radio station, their local television station, to hear about school closures and to hear about road conditions and to hear about other community closures and shelters that might be available and any number of things that are necessary in times of weather that could put them in a position of distress, so it is very, very important.

I have got some statistics here that really speak to the value proposition that they bring to our economy. In my district alone, there are 20 local television stations and 233 local radio stations in the State of Arkansas. That is statewide, not districtwide.

These broadcasters contribute \$9.83 billion to our State's GDP, and they have provided roughly 22,000 jobs in the State of Arkansas.

Beyond Arkansas, in the entire country, local broadcasters account for 2.65 million jobs, and they provide—get this—\$1.24 trillion to our GDP.

As we talked about, they provide a variety of services to communities that they support. One of the things that I didn't mention, as a broadcaster, I was a farm broadcaster, so you can appreciate this, being from North Dakota.

Most farmers rely on those market reports, weather reports, bug reports, disease reports, any number of things, information that is relevant to production agriculture that they rely on, so that was one of the things that helped launch my career. I was able to start a farm news network, operated it, started with four stations, and it is now up to 53 in a five-state area.

All of that is very specific to the local community and what is grown and raised in those communities, and so farmers have come to rely on that, and I am sure it is the same in your home State of North Dakota.

But I think the point that we are trying to make here is that every community is unique. Every community has their own needs, and no one knows those needs better than the broadcasters who serve those communities.

I just want to say, as a Congress, I think it is our duty to support broadcasters who do so much for the region and their communities, and I appreciate you taking the time to make this hour happen.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman wouldn't mind, I would like to ask a question. I know we didn't rehearse this, but in this era of all kinds of new information technologies available and ways of getting information, streaming and cell phones and smartphones and the like, maybe you could just share a minute or two about why it is still important, what role the broadcaster, the free, over-the-air broadcast through the public spectrum, why that matters in this era of new IT.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, you touched on it right there. It is free, over the air, they can access it. They don't have to have any special tool other than a radio.

Everybody's got a radio in their car or in their tractor, in their truck, in the office, whatever; and when everything else fails, you can't get a cell signal, you can't get your Internet, whatever, the radio is reliable.

From the farmers' perspectives, which obviously I have an interest in, they rely heavily on that, and there is an element of trust. Their local broadcaster is usually a trusted source of information, so that is why it is so important and why they rely so heavily on their local broadcaster, whether that be their 6 p.m. news.

I have been a news anchor on our local television station, and folks do become accustomed to hearing from you, and they trust that.

Here is the other thing that is interesting about broadcasters: they are integrating new media in conjunction with their broadcasting, so it sort of supplements what their core mission is, to provide that service to the community over the airwaves.

The great thing about broadcasters is they are very innovative. They are not a static business model. They are developing new technology, they are integrating new technology, and it all works together, with the core mission being to serve their communities.

You see fundraising efforts for the Make-A-Wish Foundation on the local radio station. That is important. Radio stations and television stations are innovative in community support activities.

AMBER Alerts, not only are they broadcasting those AMBER Alerts, but they are using texts and social media to supplement that and really help enhance their broadcasting efforts, too.

There is a lot of these things that you can't get along without, I think, without our public broadcasters, our local community broadcasters—television and radio—who operate on the airwaves.

Mr. CRAMER. Great points. Thank you so much for participating.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for having this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring an additional perspective to the importance of local broadcasters, TV, radio. I live down on the gulf coast. We call where I live in my district "hurricane alley."

Just since I have been in Congress, Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, Hurricane Humberto, Hurricane Ike, and Hurricane Gustav have all hit my congressional district. Now, some blame me. It is not my fault, but here they come, all of these hurricanes.

We are down on the gulf coast, and as soon as the hurricanes come through, guess what, there goes the power—electricity. Besides all of the flooding, the damage, the wind, all of this happens

when hurricane season comes upon us in the summer.

The local folks, to get information, if they are still at home, they are watching local TV. Many are not because they have to leave because of rising water and wind damage.

When Hurricane Ike came into Galveston, Texas, it went across the island, and then when the wind shifted, it came back across the island, but that saltwater went across and came back. Tremendous damage in Galveston, Texas.

The only thing the people could listen to or find information, really, was their car radio as they are trying to leave the area. The radio stations and TV stations that are still on the air are very vital for public safety and information and about the weather. People listen to the local broadcasters about what is happening right there.

When Hurricane Rita came into Houston in 2005, approximately 2.5 million to 3 million people evacuated. Now, some say that this is the largest evacuation in American history. I don't know. That is a lot of people on the road, and they are all headed north to get away from the wind and the rain and the flooding that is taking place.

What people were listening to in the car was local radio stations that were on the air broadcasting, not just the weather, but the traffic that was taking place. Eventually, the freeways, the interstates all allowed traffic to move on all lanes north.

The way the folks found out about that was on the radio, the announcements being made by the Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas highway department, that the lanes had been shifted so that everybody could travel in all of the lanes that took place, so that information was so vital.

It is not just important during hurricane season. As already stated by the gentleman from Arkansas, it is important during even normal weather, if we can call what is taking place here in Washington normal weather, but the snow and the ice. People want to listen to local radio to find out—and local television.

Also, even go back to Katrina. We all remember Hurricane Katrina. Folks in Louisiana left Louisiana, and they came to Texas, and as they were getting to Texas, guess what, Hurricane Rita hit Texas.

Houstonians, primarily, when those folks from Louisiana were coming our way, were told by local media on where they could go to take things for those neighbors from Louisiana, everything from food and blankets, and go volunteer to help out to find shelter for these individuals.

Local radio, local television is broadcasting how that can be done, how that can be help to those individuals. That couldn't have been done if we didn't have our local broadcasters who know the area, know the people.

We have AMBER Alerts. That is throughout the country. 206 Texas children that were abducted had been rescued because of the AMBER Alert system that was created in 1998 by the Dallas-Ft. Worth broadcasters.

The other issue that I want to mention is our—well, there are two more, and they are just as important. Local radio and television has local political issues and debates on our community, from the local politicians, the local officeholders, and even others. That is all done locally by our broadcasters on television; it is done on radio all the time. There is political argument and debate by our local media.

Something that is important to us—I don't know about the Dakotas, but it is important to us. We like football in Texas. We like high school football. Let's be a little specific. On Friday night, everybody is playing football at the high schools, at the stadiums.

Our local broadcasters, yes, they are out there at the stadiums, and at 10 p.m. news, they have a little bit of news, and then they have a little bit of weather, and then they spend most of the rest of the news broadcasting tapes from the high school football games in the Houston area.

They are very important, Mr. Speaker, to know exactly who won the game, who the visiting team was, high school football. We are not going to see that unless we have local broadcasting. Of course, high school football is on the radio as well. I do want to mention that important service that local broadcasters give us.

We have a lot of great broadcasters in the Houston area, both on radio and on television. I would like to mention some of them. Channel 13 has Dave Ward. I think he has been on television, nightly news—I don't know, I would hate to say 30 years, but maybe it has been that long or more—along with Gina Gaston.

On channel 26, we have got Jose Grinan; channel 2, Bill Balleza and Dominique Sachse; then channel 11, Greg Hurst and Lisa Hernandez.

Years ago, there was this local television celebrity that worked for channel 13. He turned out to be a celebrity named Marvin Zindler. He is an icon in the Houston area.

He is a local broadcaster, and he spent time going around in the Houston restaurants examining restaurants and, as he said, looking for slime in the ice machine. He did a nightly broadcast on restaurants that just weren't up to the health standards of the city of Houston.

Other investigative reporters are doing something very similar on the local basis as well, but it is all local. It is the local broadcasters that are doing it.

I commend the gentleman, Mr. CRAMER. I am sorry I talked so long. The local folks, we certainly couldn't exist without them. Radio, television, we appreciate what they do, not just for football, but for the other things as well.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I especially thank him for raising the football illustration, just because it is an opportunity—while he wondered if it was important in North Dakota, North Dakotans have become very accustomed to coming to Texas for football games because, for the last 4 years, the North Dakota State University football team has won the national FCS championship game in Frisco, Texas.

Thank you for reminding us of that, and we look forward to a trip next year, perhaps.

That said, I appreciate what you raised about how many broadcast stations really—they are tools of the First Amendment, and they are also, obviously, an important part of the First Amendment because that is where they derive their rights to express and to broadcast.

Where would politicians be without broadcasting debates? So I appreciate that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), just to let everybody know this is obviously a very important bipartisan Special Order because it is a very important bipartisan issue.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for the time and for organizing this Special Order.

To be sure that folks do not think that local broadcasters are only important in the Midwest, I am here representing New England. We have many, many examples where our local broadcasters have really made a difference in Rhode Island.

□ 1730

I think sometimes the best way to illustrate that is to give real examples of where that happened.

So, for example, there was a documentary made about a homeless man finding help at Crossroads, which is the largest homeless services organization in the State of Rhode Island. WPRI-TV, a local broadcaster in the city of Providence, secured the rights to this documentary and took the opportunity to create a telethon around its airing. Viewers were asked to open their hearts and their pocketbooks and pledge by phone or online, and that effort raised \$85,000 for the shelter, providing greatly needed funding as the housing crisis and economy created an ever-growing demand for the shelter services. So that is one example.

Another example is, while residents of our capital city, the city of Providence, waited for their electricity to be restored in their homes after Hurricane Irene cut off power to many in our State, WJAR-TV Providence simulcast the audio portion of its newscast on Clear Channel's WHJJ-AM Providence. This arrangement allowed locals to receive the TV station's around-the-clock coverage on battery-operated radios, which was obviously a very important service.

In our State, we have a wonderful facility, a school called Meeting Street,

which is an organization that provides individual learning programs for thousands of children with developmental disabilities. And Meeting Street is really allowed to tell the story of its wonderful school to the community each year during its annual telethon on WPRI-TV. This 4-hour, commercial-free telethon preempts prime-time programming, and all production for the event is done in-house by the station. Last year, the telethon generated \$500,000 from phone donations and long-term corporate commitments tied to the event, and it has raised billions of dollars over the years.

The local newspaper and WNRI-AM in Woonsocket, Rhode Island, carry on the Milk Fund, which is a local tradition that started in 1936 as a way to help struggling families. Each year through the month of December, multiple fundraising efforts in Woonsocket raise money toward the purchase of milk vouchers.

Another example: this past fall, listeners tuned in to WKKB-FM in Providence for its 2-day Promesa y Esperanza—Promise and Hope—Radiothon, which raises funds for St. Jude Children's Hospital. The broadcast is carried out in partnership with 15 sister stations throughout the country to raise awareness of childhood cancer within the Hispanic community and to help St. Jude continue to offer treatment to all children, regardless of their family's ability to pay. This year's effort raised more than \$100,000 in WKKB's listening area alone, and more than \$630,000 between the 16 stations combined.

And just one final example: LIN Media, which owns WPRI-TV in East Providence, established the Minority Scholarship and Training Program. Each recipient will receive a 2-year scholarship for up to \$10,000 per year, which can be used for school expenses. In addition, LIN Media will provide each student with hands-on training through a paid internship program at one of its television stations around the country. Minority Scholarship recipients are assigned full-time positions at LIN Media upon graduation and successful completion of the training program.

So these are just some examples, and I know there are examples like this all across the country where local broadcasters are really making a difference, not only helping raise needed resources for nonprofit organizations, getting information to listeners and viewers during emergencies, but really helping to strengthen our communities. And I, for one, want to acknowledge the local broadcasters and to say thank you. I hope these examples help illustrate the value of our local broadcasters.

I really thank the gentleman for organizing this Special Order hour and for yielding.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's recognition of that and the very thorough list of examples of the incredible public service that our

broadcasters do in the Northeast. Thank you very much for that.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, as I listen to my colleagues talk about the importance of local broadcasters that they really have multiple public service roles.

Certainly it is a public service to be able to give the news, to deliver the sporting games, to deliver the weather, to deliver emergency information for public safety, to let people know what is going on in the community. That is an important service. But the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) brings up, of course, many other charitable things.

I have participated in many charitable events that were good, that raised decent money for important causes. But when a broadcaster gets involved, it adds value; it raises awareness; it sometimes brings celebrity to it. And you can see a charity lifted up by virtue of the fact that a local TV station or a local radio station or, in some cases, multiple stations took on the cause—not because there is anything in it for the broadcast station, not because there is anything in it for the managers. Sure, sometimes there are programs that have a sales component to it that you can go out and sell, but by and large, these are pure acts of public service, pure acts of charity that with just a little bit of airtime, just a little bit of local personality that is attached to a cause can validate the cause, elevate the cause, bring awareness to the cause, and create momentum for a cause that generates all kinds of other private sector involvement, whether it is volunteers or money—in most cases, both. We can solve a lot of problems when we get a broadcaster involved.

I have had the opportunity to be part of a very special program that I know a lot of my colleagues have been a part of, whether out here or back at home, and that is Honor Flights. It was a local broadcaster in Fargo, North Dakota, that saw a national story about the Honor Flight program that flies World War II veterans to see the memorial built in their honor.

So WDAY radio and television took it on in Fargo and created the Red River Valley Honor Flight and flew four flights of veterans. During that time, they broadcast leading up to it to bring awareness so that the veterans, themselves, could sign up. Then they broadcast the trips themselves to bring awareness and to honor these men and women, these heroes of the Greatest Generation and then, of course, brought the celebration home in a way that you couldn't do without that involvement.

That resulted in another Honor Flight chapter being raised up in Bismarck, where I live, and I became the chairman of the Roughrider Honor Flight. We had five flights out of Bismarck.

The KX television network in North Dakota became our broadcast partner.

Not only did they help by raising awareness, which helped me raise money, which helped us get more veterans signing up, but it got the whole community involved. At the end of it all, they provided a video documentary of the experience so that every veteran and their families who participated had that wonderful memory in a DVD that they could watch for the rest of their lives.

Just this last weekend, I was on a radio show in Fargo called "Heroes of the Heartland." It is on for an hour every Saturday, where a local veteran hosts the show, and it is all about veterans. I hope the show wins an award for what it does for veterans.

While I was on the show answering questions about legislation dealing with veterans' issues, people would call in and say: Did you know that the VA in Fargo is holding a public information meeting in a neighboring city on Saturday at whatever time, where veterans can come and air their grievances or give their appreciation or learn about the VA? And I thought: Wow, how cool is this, that because somebody knew of something, not only was the radio station there able to spread the information, but the listener became the newsmaker. They became the broadcaster.

That is the other neat thing about local radio, especially: it provides an opportunity where everybody is a broadcaster. If you see an accident or you find bad weather or you see something happen that you want to alert the public about, you have that opportunity now with new media, meaning broadcast media. So it was an honor to be on "Heroes of the Heartland."

I have the great privilege of representing the entire State of North Dakota. That is a big congressional district. Now, it is not as big as Montana or Wyoming or Alaska, but it is pretty big. I try to have a lot of town halls, like many of us do. We have a lot of town halls. But I have the opportunity, working with broadcast partners now, where every week I have a 1-hour talk radio town hall on multiple stations. KFYR-AM 550 in Bismarck was sort of the flagship station. KPLC out in Dickinson carries it. AM 1100 The Flag is really where it was birthed, in Fargo. KTGO up in the Bakken, the heart of the Bakken, in Tioga, carries the talk radio town hall.

People have the opportunity to either call me live on the air and ask a question or call on an 800 number and leave a message for me if they can't call during the show itself. It is broadcast statewide, and then it is broadcast again in the evening on delay. It provides a great opportunity for me to be in touch with my constituents and for them to talk to me and for me to be able to talk to them.

As you can tell, Mr. Speaker, I am a big advocate for free over-the-air broadcast media, whether it is radio or television—or certainly both. And I think that even in the new media era,

and I appreciated the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. CRAWFORD's thoughts on this, that we have this opportunity still, but that there is still an important role for free broadcast radio and television, that even with all the new media, that it only, in fact, enhances the importance of free over-the-air broadcasts.

With that, I yield to another Member from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much. It is an honor and a privilege to be here to speak about the value our local broadcasters bring to our communities.

I am a long-time radio guy. At 15 years old, I started hanging around the radio station and ended up getting a job there through high school and college and have worked on and off in radio ever since.

I can tell you, our local broadcasters are such a value to our community. We have got a market now with all sorts of new technology for people to get music and entertainment—there is satellite radio; there is the Internet; there is Pandora—but nothing compares to what the local broadcasters can bring. Actually, all this competition, I think, is bringing a resurgence to local broadcasters. You are going away from lots of syndicated programs to more locally created programs that are more in tune to the needs of the community than something coming out from a central location piped over a satellite.

You have got great opportunities. Local businesses now have more opportunities to advertise, targeting local audiences. You have got news departments that are beginning a resurgence in local radio and television stations as people realize they need local news in addition to the national news. And in times of an emergency, nobody comes to the aid of a community like the broadcast facilities. Typically, they will suspend programming in the event of a hurricane or some other disaster. It is your first source for information, where you can go to get fresh water, other disaster and emergency aid. It really brings out the best.

Local broadcasters are committed to their community. Much like people who run for elected office, in order to get people to know you, to like you, to listen to you, and to watch you on a TV station, they have got to be out in the community, too. They have got to be at the local events, the chamber of commerce events. They have got to sponsor the charitable events. Broadcasters I know spend and donate millions of dollars in airtime just to support local charities and community activities. It is the backbone of America.

We have got to be careful up here in Washington. We have got lots of stuff on our agenda here that could potentially adversely affect broadcasters. We have got to strike the right balance.

We have got copyright reform on the agenda. We have got to find the right balance, where content creators are

properly compensated for their creative works but broadcasters aren't penalized such that they have got to shut down news departments or lay off employees in order to meet those demands. We have got to make sure that we have got licensing and the Communications Act reformed.

Our Communications Act is very old. We have got to take a look at it and bring it into the 21st century. But we have got to be careful that we don't cripple our local broadcasters, many of whom live in the communities and are valuable parts of the community and are basically, in some cases, the heartbeat of the community.

I do want to reiterate that I think we are at a time where we really can see a resurgence in local broadcasting, local content, the return of more full service. It is not just wall-to-wall hits on the radio now.

In order to garner a market competing with XM, our local folks have to be out in the community. They have to be out with live remotes. They have got to be at community events. They have got to be bringing local news and local content and stuff that is relevant to people's lives. They have done it for decades, and it is really great to see that resurgence and to be a part of it. It is a great time for broadcasters in America right now.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman from Texas would yield, you raised an important point that I hadn't thought about that is sort of natural and obvious, and that is, if you are going to be a good local broadcaster, obviously you have to be a good local citizen.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Absolutely. You have got to be out at the events. You have got to say "yes" to the folks that come in and say: Could you give us a public service announcement for our cancer walk? Could you give us a public service announcement for our whatever event?

The community bulletin boards that you used to hear on the radio all the time are coming back, and that is something XM or satellite providers just can't do.

□ 1745

Sure, they are getting the technology to localize some of the ads by downloading them into your devices. But it is not like the local broadcaster who is a part of the community.

Mr. CRAMER. You raise very important points.

Again, I appreciate the reminder that, while we are, today, educating, informing, and celebrating local broadcasting, it is at risk; that we can take our eye off the ball, that we can assume or presume some things and wake up one day and find out that when that accident happens on the railroad tracks or the storm is coming that suddenly there is nobody there to tell us about it.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. You need somebody that has a local news presence. You don't need somebody that has to

bring a satellite truck in from a few hundred miles away and can't get there immediately. Sure, The Weather Channel will send Jim Cantore down. I think they want to kill him because they send him to all the dangerous locations. But he doesn't know the community like the local weathercaster.

We have got Dale Nelson in Corpus Christi. He has been doing the weather on our NBC affiliate. We jokingly call him "Dead Wrong Dale." What other profession can you be in besides being a TV meteorologist and get it wrong half the time and still keep a job? But Dale knows the community, and he gets it right a whole lot more than he gets it wrong. We just like to rib him. But he knows the places that are going to flood. He knows the areas in the neighborhoods that are most susceptible to damage. Those out-of-town reporters don't.

The members of the media in local broadcasting are citizens of the community, and what they do improves the lives of everybody in the community. They know the people. They shop at the grocery store with the folks. Their children are in school in the community. They know what is going on, and they can reflect what is going on and can react to what is going on in the community and really be a valuable asset for good.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, you are a very articulate spokesman and advocate on behalf of local broadcasting, and I appreciate your taking the time and your expertise. By the way, you did pose it in the form of a question. I suppose some people can look at Congress and say: There is a group that can be wrong more than half the time and keep their jobs too. But at any rate, I have noticed that if you stay in good contact through your broadcast community with your constituents that helps as well.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I appreciate your yielding the time and organizing this wonderful Special Order.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, it is very important because as I said, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, over 600 broadcasters are in town today calling on the Members of Congress, calling on us, reminding us of the important role that they play in public safety, in public information, in public service, in many ways, in many ways, not just in delivering the news, weather, and sports and being active in our communities and elevating those important causes that make for a quality community, contributing their talent, contributing their, of course, their broadcast spectrum, which is really the people's. I think that is really an important point that we sometimes forget—that there is a reason that broadcasters have this legal obligation to public service because the people own the airwaves, and we rent them, if you will.

It is important that broadcasters and Congress stay in close touch because, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, this is a fragile relationship, and

we can sometimes take them for granted while presuming that there will always be other ways to communicate when we know, in fact, that when the lights go out, when the electricity goes off, when a storm hits, whatever the case may be, as long as you have a car radio and a good battery, or you have a battery-operated radio and the broadcasters are on the air, you can always get that information from your local, reliable, familiar, friendly broadcasters.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and I appreciate my colleagues from both sides of the aisle from across our country who have taken the time today to help inform, educate, and celebrate the American broadcaster.

THE FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, tonight is the inaugural Special Order hour of the Future Forum. Today young people across America are asking themselves how they are going to afford their education. And if they are even lucky enough to get an education, how they are going to be able to afford to pay off that education, how they are going to find a well-paying job that can help them pay off that education, buy their first home, start a family, and send their own kids to school. That is the issue that the Future Forum is going to address. We are going to address this issue, the American Dream of homeownership, and something very important to millennials, diversity and equality.

Millennials make up about 75 million people of the American population. It is the most diverse generation in America's history. We believe in the Future Forum that we are uniquely suited for this because we are a part of the future too, and it is time that the party of the future starts talking to the future. We will be taking time on the House floor and at events around the country to meet with and listen to younger Americans about how we in government can better ensure that younger Americans have the opportunities that will allow them not only to dream but to achieve. This is a two-way conversation. We will use technology and a collaborative approach in our communications and in our outreach.

Our policy priorities are very simple: college access and affordability, job security and entrepreneurship, and equality and diversity. Many of the members of the Future Forum were called to public service because of what happened on September 11. A recent Center for American Progress survey found that the defining issue for millennials is September 11.

As I stand in this well, we are just 3 days from the Department of Homeland Security being shut down. I have invited members of the Future Forum to share their own personal story about how they were called to service and what homeland security means to them and their constituents.

I would first like to invite down a freshman Member. I yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous speaker for exercising tremendous leadership in helping to forge this, the Future Forum. I am proud to join him in being a founding member of this important caucus, one that I hope will go out and touch the lives of many young people throughout the country.

In having a conversation with the previous speaker about what brought him to public service and what brought me to public service, I was relaying my personal story, and that happened to involve September 11. I was not one of the heroes by any means, just one of the ordinary Americans working in the private sector straight out of college, attempting to pay off a ton of student loans, and right here in the Washington, D.C., area, just a couple miles from the Pentagon, that bright blue-skied beautiful morning when the world suddenly changed.

Mark Twain had said a long time ago that America's two best friends in the world are Miss Atlantic and Mr. Pacific. September 11, 2001, proved that that was no longer the case, that we were not a separate fortress unto ourselves and completely removed from the problems around the world. That was, as the previous speaker mentioned, such an important event in my life and in the lives of so many people in their thirties and younger.

As a member of this September 11 generation, I decided right then that I would devote my life to public service. The very next year, actually, on September 11, 2002, I began my graduate program in public policy and embarked on a path that about 14 years later has led here to serving in the Halls of the House of Representatives, attempting to make a difference, solve problems, and do so on a bipartisan basis.

I know there are many people on the other side of the aisle, good Republicans, who feel the same way I do; that we can have our legitimate debates, that we can have our debates on public policy, but that when it comes, of all things, to the security of the American people, we need to put the nonsense aside and actually focus on protecting our people.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we had come down here and planned to speak about the Future Forum, I had expected that my speech would be about the student loan debt crisis, something that is deeply affecting our generation, a generation that is more indebted than any other in our Nation's history. But, in-

stead, we are here to talk about the fact we are just 3 days away from seeing the Department of Homeland Security completely shut down, seeing the furloughing of 35,000 employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

On the very same day that information was released, three American citizens attempted to join ISIS, which should be called Daesh, the so-called Islamic State, who truly are evil and would do whatever they could to harm any one of the 310 million of us living in this country.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you talk about your call to service and after September 11, and you think back to that day, and I don't know if you remember, but I remember Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, standing on the stairs of the Capitol, on the steps of the Capitol and singing "God Bless America" and "America the Beautiful." It was such a moment of collaboration. Every day since that day, up until now, homeland security and our Nation's security has always been about collaboration and bipartisanship. I just wonder, to hear that the Department of Homeland Security could be shutting down, hearkening back to what you thought about collaboration back then, does that gel, is that the collaboration that you had in mind and you always thought of around our Nation's security?

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman asks a great question. Actually it is the exact opposite of the sort of spirit that was invoked on September 11. I remember seeing the pictures of—I believe it was a spontaneous gathering of both Democratic and Republican Members serving in Congress at that time who came together on the Capitol steps to sing "God Bless America."

I think it is a sad commentary that just a decade and a half later that we are here at an incredibly dangerous time, mind you, in some ways actually more dangerous than the days immediately following September 11, and instead of talking about how we can come together in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, pass this what should be noncontroversial bill to fund our Department of Homeland Security, the fact that we are right here caught up in a partisan fight over this is deeply disappointing and does not at all jibe with the spirit of September 11, and I think the spirit of a generation that was called to serve in the wake of those events.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), someone who has served our country not just in California's Legislature and not just in the Congress but also in our armed services, and is currently serving in the Air Force Reserves.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, let me start off by saying elections have consequences. I respect

the American voter. I respect what the voters in our Nation did last November when they gave Republicans control of the United States Senate and control of the U.S. House of Representatives. My sincere plea and request to my Republican colleagues across the aisle who control Congress is: Please do not shut down the Department of Homeland Security.

The Republican leader in the U.S. Senate is now poised to delink the issue of funding for security for our homeland from immigration reform. I hope my colleagues across the aisle will do the same. That is because immigration reform has very little to nothing to do with protecting our homeland. I would love to have a debate on immigration reform. I think we need to do that. I would love to vote for bills on immigration reform. But they are not linked to funding for Homeland Security.

Let me just give you an example. Let's talk about DREAMers who came as children to our Nation and who can serve in the United States military. I served in Active Duty in the Air Force, and I am still in the Reserves. So DREAMers can serve in the U.S. military. To say that we are going to deport them because they are a homeland security risk and we are not going to fund Homeland Security because of that is ridiculous. There is no reason to link those two issues. If you don't like DREAMers, if you want to deport DREAMers, fine. Let's have a debate on that. But they are not a homeland security risk. To link these two issues doesn't make any sense. The Republican leader in the United States Senate has figured that out. I hope that this House does it as well.

There are some grave consequences to this. In my State of California alone, nearly 27,000 employees of Homeland Security will either be furloughed or will get no pay and cannot come to work.

□ 1800

These folks are folks that protect our homeland. It is unacceptable that this is going to happen.

The other way Homeland Security works is they provide grants to local first responders across the Nation to law enforcement, to firefighters. On Friday, if Homeland Security shuts down, those grants stop, and these local responders stop.

This is a very real issue, and we, in Congress, our first priority is to protect the American public. Shutting down Homeland Security will be the exact opposite of that. I really hope that the Republicans who control both Houses do not shut down Homeland Security.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I also wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from California thinks, as somebody who is serving in the Reserves right now and serving shoulder to shoulder with some young DREAMers, what would it do to the morale of

the ranks if DREAMers who are putting themselves on the front lines, willing to go serve the country they call their own, the United States, in battle, if the House GOP had their way and those DREAMers were removed and deported from our country?

What would that do to the morale of our troops?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a great question. Let me just explain a little bit what are some of the professions that the DREAMers do in the military.

Because of their language skills, the U.S. military needs some of these language skills, so that the U.S. military knows what these terrorists are doing in other parts of the world.

To have the language skills that DREAMers possess, that is one reason that we have them serve in the U.S. military. They have a direct effect on trying to prevent terrorist attacks into our homeland. To say that “we are not going to fund Homeland Security because we want to deport you” is ridiculous.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

There are a few categories that the DREAMers are able to serve in the military. You mention their language talent.

As somebody who, himself, is in the military, don't you think we are missing out on a lot of potential among kids that have already gone through the DACA program, but we are still not admitting as regular enlistees or no less given the chance to become officers?

I know a kid in my district, his whole life, he wanted to be in the military. He didn't even find out that he wasn't American until he was 15. He went through DACA, he did everything right, and they are still not letting him join the military.

What kind of talent are we missing out on by not letting these DACA kids enlist in the regular manner?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a fantastic question. Having now been in the military for 19 years, it is very clear that their main criteria for military service is: Can you complete the mission?

How good you are at completing the mission has nothing to do with whether or not you have a piece of paper that says if you are documented or not. The U.S. military is losing out on a significant amount of talent, people who otherwise would do great things for our military to protect our homeland and so on.

Again, it makes very little to no sense to link these two issues, which really shouldn't be linked; really, that is what this is all about. Let's just have separate debates on both issues. The U.S. Senate is about to do that.

I hope the House can do that as well.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to join our conversation another fresh-

man Member from Massachusetts, somebody who has also served our country very honorably in the Marines, SETH MOULTON.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SWALWELL.

I think our Republican colleagues have a point, which is that we need to have a debate about immigration. This is an issue facing our country, it is a serious issue, and in many respects, it has reached crisis proportions. We need to talk about it, we need to have that debate, but it cannot be at the expense of our Nation's security.

I just returned from a weeklong trip to the Middle East—to Iraq, to Afghanistan, to the UAE, to Kuwait, and to Jordan—to try to understand the situation on the ground and especially the threat that ISIL or Daesh poses to the United States of America.

I can tell you that that threat is serious and severe. There are those who think that this will just be a Middle Eastern problem, that it won't ever come to infect our homeland. I don't share that view. I think it is a serious threat. ISIL has brutally killed Americans abroad and made clear their intentions to kill Americans here at home.

That is the kind of protection from threats like that that the Department of Homeland Security provides. We cannot put our Nation's security at risk for a debate that is critical, that needs to happen, but that is separate from keeping Americans safe.

Our most sacred responsibility as Members of Congress is to protect our homeland. Right now, the partisan brinksmanship around funding the Department of Homeland Security is putting that safety at risk.

I served my country for four tours in Iraq. I was proud to serve, I was proud to go every time, but I don't want to see Americans have to keep going back to that part of the world because we can't provide for our security here at home.

We have a lot of work to do in this Congress, and a lot of it requires bipartisan cooperation. Immigration is one of those issues. It is an issue that we need to debate on the floor of the House.

We need to take up the Senate bill for comprehensive immigration reform, debate its merits, and decide whether it does enough to ensure the safety of our borders and the future of those who aspire to be Americans, but none of that should happen at the expense of our Nation's security.

The crisis that we are facing today is the result of partisan politics that places the safety and the lives of the American people at risk.

Last week I returned from a trip to the Middle East, and I learned that the threat of a terrorist attack on the United States is real. Terrorist organizations including ISIL pose a serious national security threat and have made clear their intentions to commit acts of terrorism both abroad and here at home.

Our number one responsibility as members of Congress is to prevent that from happening and keep Americans safe.

Holding hostage the funding for the Department of Homeland Security over the President's executive action on immigration is a disservice to the men and women who put their lives on the line everyday both at home and abroad to protect us all.

There is no doubt that Congress needs to address immigration reform. It is an issue that is deserving of a debate and I look forward to participating in that discussion with both Democrats and Republicans. However, attaching immigration policy to this appropriations legislation is simply irresponsible and hijacks the intellectual debate that should take place on this floor.

If you disagree with the President's actions, then let's have that debate.

However, with such threats to the security of the American people, now is not the time to play political games with an agency that is charged with protecting the homeland from acts of terrorism.

If Congress fails to fund the Department of Homeland Security, agencies and grant programs critical to the safety of Americans will no longer be able to carry out the responsibilities that they were created to uphold, including the TSA, U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the United States Coast Guard. 85% of all enlisted Coast Guard personnel do not live on base—they cannot afford to miss a rent or mortgage payment on their homes. Many Americans don't realize this, but not only are Coast Guardsmen important to the safety of fishermen in my home state of Massachusetts and to all coastal states, but they are also deployed globally alongside our military in support of critical national security missions.

When I was in Iraq, I needed to focus on the mission. For Coast Guard personnel performing high-risk drug cartel interdictions or patrolling the Persian Gulf, we needed their 100% focus on the mission at hand. So last summer when an Iranian boat aimed a 50 caliber machine gun at American Coast Guardsmen deployed in international waters in the Persian Gulf, those are the American men and women in harm's way who would still be required to put their lives on the line despite not receiving a paycheck so that their families at home can put food on the table and pay rent.

In my home state of Massachusetts, we recently experienced a series of historic snow storms that resulted in record-breaking snow accumulation and caused millions of dollars in damages to homes, business and roadways. Without the support of funding from FEMA, Massachusetts will have to bear the brunt of the clean-up and repair costs in spite of the likelihood that Massachusetts will be eligible for federal disaster aid relief.

Further, failure to pass an appropriations bill for DHS would furlough or deny payment to the 4,735 law enforcement officials, disaster response officials and many other homeland security personnel in Massachusetts.

Republicans know that the right thing to do is to fund the department. This is why, earlier today, the Senate passed a clean bill to fund the department.

This is not a partisan issue. This is an American issue. I implore the Republicans to have the debate on immigration, and have it soon. Talk about our differences there, but let's not put our citizens, our country, and our allies at risk by holding funding for the Department of Homeland Security hostage.

I'd like to thank my friend from California again for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Actually, I have a question for the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know you are active on social media, I follow you, and I see you are very in touch with your constituents, particularly those on social media.

I am wondering: What are you hearing from young people about the House GOP's inability to fund the Department of Homeland Security? What do young people think about the inability to separate an important immigration issue, as you talked about, and something so critical and as important as homeland security?

Mr. MOULTON. What I hear from young people is they want the Congress to get things done for the American people. Our job is to come here and debate the important issues of the day, but, ultimately, it is to get things accomplished, it is to pass bills, it is to make laws, it is to fund important institutions of our government.

What people say is they want us to get it done. They want us to have that debate on immigration reform, they want us to do that, too, but they need funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

My generation has grown up under the threat that we came to face on September 11. Many of my friends were in New York on that perilous day and watched the planes crash into the World Trade Center towers. It is a remarkable testament to the success of the Department of Homeland Security that, over the past decade, we have not had another attack. It is a remarkable achievement. We should not put that achievement at risk.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I invite to join the conversation a leader in our party, someone who serves on the House Rules Committee and also the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for getting this time for this important message and to just talk with people. That is really what this body, at its very best, does: we talk amongst ourselves, we solve problems.

What you are hearing about today, namely, that we are 3 days away from shutting down our own national security, is an example of this body not solving a problem—in fact, causing a problem.

You think: Who is causing this? Why is our security going to shut down in 3 days? Who is doing this? Who is shutting down the Department of Homeland Security?

The sad answer is that we are doing it to ourselves. There is no reason for this manufactured crisis.

I want to share my story from 9/11. 9/11 is something that, in our generation, we all remember where we were. It is

like the Kennedy assassination to our grandparents' generation or like the Moon landing. Everybody knows exactly where they were and what they were doing when we heard about the Twin Towers.

I was at a conference near Washington, D.C., here. Like anybody who was near one of the sites, it was scary because we didn't know what was going on. The rumor was: all planes are flying into buildings, we are under attack.

They thought there were bombs at one point. It was a madhouse to try to escape the area and get out of the city. We drove all the way back to Colorado, and I never got to see what was happening to the towers in realtime or the immediate aftermath because, for the next 25 hours, I was just listening to it on the radio in the car, and my friend and I took turns driving.

That was a unique moment when people came together. It didn't matter if you were Democrat or Republican. Our petty differences melted by the wayside as we came together around a national response.

In many ways, it is sad to see our Nation go back to those same kind of partisan divisions which, unfortunately, reduce our national security. When we are talking about the Department of Homeland Security—which I would point out was set up after 9/11. That was set up to ensure that something like 9/11 doesn't happen again.

It coordinated agencies in a new way that didn't occur before, encouraged intelligence sharing among the agencies about domestic threats, and now, a lot of that work is just 3 days away from being defunded over a totally different issue, one that we are happy to talk about, by the way.

I mean, we talk about DREAMers and what a pathway to citizenship could look like and immigration reform and what the President can do and can't do, and those are all important discussions, and there are many diverse opinions in this body about them.

I would hope nobody with any opinion, no matter how extreme, would hold our national security hostage over this. I am reminded of what one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, disappointed in his own party over this particular strategy.

He said: "Unfortunately, we have taken a hostage that we don't want to shoot." I think that is very much the case. Yes, they are taking our own security of our Nation and the Department of Homeland Security hostage. Do they actually want to shoot that hostage?

Our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they are not bad people. They believe in protecting our country. I hope they don't go through with it, but they have gotten themselves into this predicament over rhetoric that threatens to jeopardize our national security.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I would ask my colleague, knowing that,

as we speak—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed this out, Mr. BOYLE—three Americans are in custody right now because of their intent and the steps they took to want to join ISIL. As we speak, our enemies are plotting against us.

Although my colleagues across the aisle, the House Republican leadership, wish to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, our enemies do not intend on shutting down their efforts to attack America.

What do you think, knowing that Colorado is home to a large airport, Denver International Airport, what is going to happen to the TSA officers who are charged with detecting these hidden bombs that al Qaeda has put out there that they would like to put on our airliners, detecting people who are trying to come back to the United States after fighting alongside with ISIL, what is this going to mean in places like Denver and across Colorado?

Mr. POLIS. We had a young lady from our district—you mentioned people—we had a young lady from our district, 19, from Lafayette, Colorado, who tried to get over to Turkey and then to Syria to join ISIS.

Fortunately, for her parents, for her family, frankly, for her own life, thanks to the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security, it was interdicted. Her travel plans were detected, and she was detained at the airport and not allowed to join ISIS.

Thank goodness we had the Department of Homeland Security connecting those difficult-to-connect dots. I don't even know how they did it to this day because, obviously, people go to Turkey on tourism all the time, but they used several points of information to figure out that this young lady was trying to join ISIS, and, thankfully, they were able to return her to her family.

That is the kind of thing that, unfortunately, happens every day across our country. If in 3 days this Congress doesn't take action, we are tying our own hands behind our back in our fight against terrorism, which makes absolutely no sense.

Look, you and I, Mr. SWALWELL, I am sure, were equally passionate about our views on immigration. We would love to see DACA expanded, and I would love to see a pathway to citizenship, but it would never cross my mind, no matter how I want to see those things, that I would shut down the security of the country just to get it.

I think most Americans don't think that way. I mean, here we are as some of the young Members, I think that perhaps some colleagues on the other side are acting even younger, like preschoolers and kindergartners here, where they either get all the toys or they are not letting anybody else play with them.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We haven't named that generation yet.

Mr. POLIS. We haven't named them yet.

That is the approach here. If they don't get their exact way, well, fine, we are not going to keep the Nation safe. I mean, that just doesn't make sense in any deliberative body, like we all grew up thinking that Congress was the lofty deliberative body.

That just doesn't make sense, that kind of reasoning.

□ 1815

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. SWALWELL, I would just take issue. My wife, as you may know, is a kindergarten teacher and is teaching that generation, and I think she would take issue with you comparing Members of Congress to the kids she teaches. I think she would say the kids she teaches are much better behaved than many of us here in Congress.

But, you know, I do want to just circle back to a point that Mr. POLIS made, Mr. SWALWELL made, a number of the speakers here tonight have made. This is a false choice. We can have the necessary debate on immigration and immigration reform. There has been a great American tradition going back to the very beginning of, on the one hand, praising the immigrants of yesteryear while simultaneously expressing concern about the immigrants of the present day. That was the case in the 1840s and in the 1880s and in the 1920s, and so it is today.

That debate will always be a part of who we are as a nation of immigrants and as a nation of laws. I think that debate needs to happen, and we need to have that here on the floor of the House, the same way they did in the Senate where they passed the bill with 70 votes on a bipartisan basis.

So let's get to that debate. Let's not allow this sideshow over holding up a Homeland Security bill that I think all of us agree here, all 435 of us agree that we need. These are real, dangerous threats we face, people who actually thought that al Qaeda was not extreme enough so they wanted to go, instead, join an even more murderous, more barbaric group. As the sign that Mr. SWALWELL had up was showing, our enemies are certainly not shutting down their efforts, nor should we.

I do want to ask Mr. SWALWELL a question—and I think this is important whether you are near the Denver Airport or the Philadelphia Airport or the bay area—and that is: What message do you think it sends to ordinary citizens who are looking to their Congress to just get things done and protect them, the people who aren't necessarily strongly ideological one way or the other, who just want to believe that their government can work, what kind of message do you think we are sending to them this week with this sort of behavior?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. It is a message of dysfunction.

And I know Mr. POLIS, just like Mr. MOULTON, is also very much in touch with the doers and DREAMers who are

defining the innovation economy, whether it is in the bay area or Colorado or Philadelphia or Boston and Cambridge. These folks, they see the shortest distance between two points as a straight line. They don't see it as a partisan line. They are problem solving by nature, and they can't understand why politics would get in the way of something so simple as funding the Department of Homeland Security.

My own personal September 11 story, as Mr. POLIS was saying, is: I was headed to Capitol Hill that morning. I was an intern for Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher. I remember the gray suit that I was wearing was the one I wore every day at that time as I was wracking up my own student debt. As I got to the Capitol, I was turned around because the building had been evacuated. What I do remember, though, in addition to the color of the suit I wore and the phone call that I got from the staff assistant telling me to go home, I remember those Members of Congress singing "God Bless America."

I remember in the weeks and the months and the years afterwards the bipartisan 9/11 Commission Report. I remember the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, and I felt so honored when I was elected to come to Congress to be asked to serve on the Committee on Homeland Security. I felt so honored in my second term to be asked to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I cannot believe that just 14 years later, after all this bipartisanship and collaboration, while every other issue around us seems to be mired in gridlock, we have always agreed that we fund the Department of Homeland Security that was created out of September 11. Today, to think that we are so close to shutting down that Department, it really does defy the collaboration that came out of September 11.

I would ask my colleague from Colorado, who is in the Future Forum, but he is one of the more senior Members of Congress in the Future Forum—I think he is now serving his fourth term—what do you think about the collaboration that we have seen around Homeland Security up until now?

Mr. POLIS. As I like to remind my friend from California, there is not really a strict age limit, per se, of the Future Forum, but I am very proud to still be under the 40 number, at least for another half year.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are all in our thirties here.

Mr. POLIS. Good. We are all still in our thirties.

But look, I think that what is happening is that when people of all ages, but particularly young people look at Congress and they look at this kind of thing with, "Well, you, yourselves, are shutting down security?" when they look at that, when they look at when the whole government shut down, again, do we remember why? Not really. I don't remember why the Republicans shut down government. There

wasn't really a reason. They gave up, and they reopened it. It didn't make sense. When people see that, they lose faith in this institution; they lose faith in democracy; they lose faith in themselves. We can't allow that to happen.

The only way for this body to change, for the quality of government to change, is for people to be invested in that change, to have that same sense of solidarity that came after 9/11, not just around disasters, but every day; when it is election day, to make sure to vote; when it is time to write and call your Congressperson, if you have a Congressperson who thinks it is okay to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, call that Congressperson, show up at their town hall meeting. Guess what. It is not okay to play games with our national security.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, many kindergartners are more mature than somebody who either wants to have it their way or not at all and to send all the toys home. That is really what we face here in this scenario. I think we have really hit upon one of the reasons that people of all ages, but particularly younger people, are losing faith not just in this institution, but as a part of the democracy it represents and how it really is our role to try and reinfuse that hope in not just, again, the competency of this institution, but the institution of representative government and the vision that our Founding Fathers put in place through the Constitution.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Something we haven't really talked too much about yet, and we have alluded to the fact that we are charging these transportation safety officers with detecting these hidden bombs that al Qaeda is determined to put on our airplanes, we are charging the Border Patrol agents to protect our border and make sure that is secure, but if this shutdown happens, they still have to do that job. The threats continue to elevate and escalate, but those employees will not get paid.

I wonder what my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, someone who flies home, logs a lot of miles going back and forth between Washington and his district, flying into Logan, you look those transportation safety officers in the eye every week when you are coming to Washington and getting off the plane in Boston, what is the morale going to be among our TSA workforce, among our Border Patrol workforce if they still have to do the job as the threats escalate but we are not going to pay them?

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Mr. SWALWELL.

There is no question that their morale and their mission effectiveness will be hurt. In fact, it will hurt my own morale because I am very proud to serve in the United States Congress, but I am not going to be proud to walk through that security gate and have to

look them in the eye when they recognize that I am partly responsible, as a Member of this body, for not giving them the basic pay that they need for their families.

You know, another element of the Department of Homeland Security is the U.S. Coast Guard, and many of us know that the U.S. Coast Guard protects our shores. I represent the fishing community of Gloucester north of Boston, and Gloucester has gone through some hard times and has often had to rely on the Coast Guard to save its fishermen in the worst storms. Those Coast Guardsmen not only protect fishermen in Gloucester. They also work with our military and Department of Defense overseas. There are Coast Guardsmen and -women stationed in the Middle East today.

Can you imagine having to do such a difficult mission, to be in the Persian Gulf defending American ships against the threat of an Iranian attack and yet not knowing whether your rent will be paid back at home? That is an unacceptable risk for us to take, and it is an unacceptable burden for us to ask them to bear. You are absolutely right, sir, this is going to severely impact their morale. When morale is impacted, it hurts their ability to do this incredibly important job.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. While the workers are going to still have to do the job and not get paid, much of the Department will shut down, and an important part that will shut down will be Department of Homeland Security grants.

I have had the opportunity in just the last few weeks to go and visit about a half dozen firehouses. I call them firehouse chats. I just pop in and meet with the brave men and women who are serving as firefighters in our community. If this shutdown happens, for example, we will see all of the assistance to firefighters' grants stopped. So the men and women who are responding to car accidents, building fires, God forbid, if a terrorist attack occurred, the people who are going to run into the burning buildings, who rely upon these grants to hire firefighters, to give them the equipment they need, that is all going to be stopped.

So I am wondering if you have heard in your district or if you have talked to your law enforcement and public safety officials about the grants they depend upon and what it would mean if that funding just went cold.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. It would be, in a word, devastating.

I am proud of the fact that a part of the district I represent is the city of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Fire Department, one of the largest and oldest in our Nation, also a number of volunteer fire departments in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. There are so many of them around the country. To put them in this position is just deeply unfair.

I am also thinking, as I am looking to my friend to the right, fellow freshman, Mr. MOULTON, he happens to be from Massachusetts. They right now are devastated with mountains of snow that fortunately most of us in the rest of the country, while we have had snow, not nearly the way they have had it in New England. It is important to note that a number of those who work in FEMA are the officials who receive those grant applications, those emergency applications that so many in Massachusetts and Vermont and other parts of New England and other parts of the country are applying for right now because they have been so overstretched, given this incredible winter that we have had and record breaking in terms of snow. So they can keep on doing the applications and applying for assistance. The only problem is, come Saturday, we shut down the Department of Homeland Security, there will be no one on the other end to receive them.

I want to make one final point, and I think that this really strikes at the heart of why we are here and why the Future Forum was created.

This is my first year in the House. I might end up serving one term, might end up serving 10, who knows? For anyone who serves here, they all talk about the fact that it goes by extremely quickly. We, right now, are Members of a body with an approval rating of approximately 9 percent. I don't want to dedicate my life to public service in an area that is so poorly regarded by the American people. That is not something I want to do. I don't think that is something that other Members on the other side want to do.

It is important to our American democracy that whatever your ideology may be, whatever political positions you may have, we have to show the American people that their institutions of government can work. The American people, the overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans, have lost confidence in us, in all of us. I don't think this kind of a political fight, frankly, benefits either side. I think it is only a race to who loses less. We can end this now. Let's do the responsible thing, the mature thing, the right thing. Fund Homeland Security, and then get on to the important debates that we must be having.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right, Mr. BOYLE. Mr. MOULTON talked about this. We are taking an issue—immigration—that there are two sharply different sides on in this House, and that is fine. That debate needs to happen. Most people on our side, almost everyone on our side wants a pathway to citizenship. But that debate must happen.

Because of that debate, what we are seeing is the one issue that we have always agreed on since the Department of Homeland Security was created is now as divisive as the immigration issue, meaning that the Republicans would like to politicize an issue that

has always had bipartisan support and make that just as divisive as they have made the immigration issue. I think that is, frankly, unfortunate.

Mr. MOULTON, I would invite you to close here on just your overall perspective on why we should or should not tie immigration to Department of Homeland Security funding.

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Mr. SWALWELL.

You are absolutely right, because immigration is a debate that we need to have. It is a national security debate in and of itself. We cannot hold the Department of Homeland Security hostage to that debate. It needs to occur. We ought to have that debate. We ought to have it here on the floor of the House. But our most sacred responsibility and the present threat here is to make sure that our people are safe.

□ 1830

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend and colleague, Mr. BOYLE, for bringing up the issue of FEMA grants. We have been faced with unprecedented snowfall in Massachusetts, and it has put our first responders to the test. They are providing for the security of the people of Massachusetts right now, and we are all banding together to make sure that we get the FEMA grants that we need and deserve. In fact, it is a great example of a crisis that is bringing Republicans and Democrats together. The Democratic delegation of Massachusetts is working hand in hand with our Republican Governor to make sure that we get these applications in so that we can get this funding that we desperately need. Yet that is all going to grind to a halt if the Department of Homeland Security is not funded.

Right here, today, we can see the effects that failing to fund the Department, shutting it down, will have. Even worse would be if we had to see the effects of another attack on our homeland. Having been to the Middle East in the past week, having seen the unprecedented challenges that our first responders face at home, we cannot afford to put our Nation's security at risk. All of the young people out there—those who are our age in the Future Forum—want a government that works. They want a government they can believe in, and they want a government that will make them safe.

Let's pass a clean funding bill. Let's fund the Department of Homeland Security. And let's show the American people that our Congress can do its job.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I thank my colleagues from California, Colorado, and from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying, as Mr. MOULTON alluded to, our principal responsibility can be found in, literally, the first sentence of the Constitution, which is: We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union . . . to provide for

the common defense of the United States.

There is no agency that has a harder job or a job that is more important in protecting our homeland than the Department of Homeland Security. We should be here today, on our first evening of the Future Forum, talking about the rising amount of student debt that millennials carry. We should be here today talking about how hard it is to get a job if you are a young person and if you have just finished college. We should be here today talking about how hard it is to buy a home if you are carrying all of this student debt. We should be talking about the need for diversity and about having a pathway to citizenship for immigration.

Instead, bizarrely, we are here talking about the real possibility that the Department of Homeland Security, created out of a bipartisan coalition in the early 2000s, could shut down and leave us more vulnerable.

I hope that our better angels will guide us. I hope that the spirit that those House Members had when they stood on the steps of the Capitol after September 11 prevails, that we work more collaboratively, and that we remember, at the end of the day, we are charged with protecting the people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

THE PRESIDENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL OVERREACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House this evening, and I appreciate the opportunity to continue the conversation that was started by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tonight.

Listen, there is a future in this body that, hopefully, is going to look a lot different than what it has looked like in past decades. I would fully concur that government should work and that we should keep the government open, but we must also defend the Constitution, and that is the paradox that we are faced with this week. I rise with some frustration from my side of the aisle and from what I have seen from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in recent days.

I have seen speeches upon speeches upon speeches about a partial shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. I have seen big signs in the well of this House, scaring the American people about a potential partial

shutdown. I have seen press conferences across the country, including in my hometown of the Tampa Bay area, scaring the American people about something that has not yet happened. Recognize that all of these speeches, all of these signs are coming not from members of our community, not from the people who elected us; these speeches, these signs—the “sky is falling” mentality—are coming from our elected leaders, from Members of this body.

Why does that matter? Why do I rise tonight to continue the conversation started by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

It is this: all we are hearing are speeches, and all we are seeing are signs. We are not hearing solutions.

To this entire body—to both sides of the aisle—our constitutional authority was infringed upon when the President signed his executive order. That is not a partisan issue. We have a responsibility to confront that constitutional overreach. Yes, one mechanism we used to do that was the power of the purse. That is a fundamental power of this body, the power of the purse, and it was appropriate that we responded to the President's unconstitutional overreach by exercising our constitutional privilege, that of the appropriations process.

Here is what I would point out to the American people tonight about the speeches that they hear from my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Recognize something very important: what is being presented in the midst of this debate over the constitutional overreach of the President is merely an “all or nothing” approach. It is either we pass a clean bill—and as the leader on the other side said, he will deliver 188 votes if we pass a clean bill—or it is nothing. Friends, colleagues, that is not legislating. That is using the bully pulpit. That is politics. That is not legislating.

So what I would ask tonight is: Where are the solutions? Where is the conviction on the other side of the aisle? Where are the efforts to pass a bill that accommodates all Members of this body, Members on the other side, and, yes, something the President can sign?

You see, I am actually a Member of Congress who thinks that the first priority of this body is to fund the government and to fund the Department of Homeland Security. I am looking to work with colleagues on the other side of the aisle to say: How do we do that? We have a responsibility to do that.

I have three Coast Guard installations in my district. They are men and women—it is absolutely true what is talked about—who will have to go to work on Saturday morning with only the promise to be paid later. That is wrong. That is a failure of this Congress if we let that happen.

We do have until Friday evening to solve this, and I believe we will, but I am asking, actually, for accommoda-

tion and cooperation from the other side of the aisle. What will it take? What will it take?

Think about this: Rather than putting signs on the floor, rather than condemning our side of the aisle for trying to respond to the constitutional overreach of the President, what if we talk about provisions that will actually build consensus and get a majority of this body, regardless of Republican, Democrat, Independent—whoever you are—to fund the Department of Homeland Security and to also respond to the constitutional overreach of the President? I think we can get there.

Do you know what I have never heard from the other side of the aisle? I have never heard: What if we remove the funding prohibition in the original House bill that prohibited the implementation, the further exercise, of DACA? They criticized it. If we remove it, does that get us the votes to pass a bill?

I understand there is disagreement over the President's executive order from last September. I think it was wrong. Members on the other side don't. A Federal judge has said it is unconstitutional. The President of the United States said over 20 times he didn't have the authority to do it. Yet he did it. What if we allowed 6 months to let the courts work their will? It is perfectly reasonable.

If you are a Member of this Congress who stood up on opening day and took the oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, to defend and protect the obligation of your office, why don't we agree upon a 6-month delay in the implementation of the President's executive order, an executive order a Federal judge has already put a hold on? Does that get us there? Does that get us the votes necessary?

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tonight said is absolutely true: Congress should work, Congress should govern. The American people should expect that of all of us.

It doesn't matter our partisan affiliations, but it does matter whether or not we truly exercise the convictions about which we pontificate on the floor here tonight. It is not about signs. It is not about the bully pulpit. It is not about press conferences.

Any Member who stands up here tonight, Republican or Democrat, and says that we will be worse off as a nation on Friday night if we have not funded the Department of Homeland Security is absolutely right. We must fund the government. But where is the effort on the other side of the aisle to actually reach a compromise? It is not there.

I promise you that I have watched my colleagues from the time I got here this week—every speech. The leader on the other side of the aisle made an impassioned speech about the importance of funding Homeland Security, and he is right.

My question is this: When will you abandon your “all or nothing” approach? Because exactly what you criticize this side of the aisle for is exactly the type of behavior that my colleagues on the other side are engaging in as well. We have failed the American people if we let that lack of cooperation overtake this body and lead us off a cliff on Friday night.

The question to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is: Who is willing to step forward with a proposal that gets us there as a body?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time this evening. I look forward to ensuring that our Department of Homeland Security is fully funded come Friday night.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-12)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency declared on March 1, 1996, with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, as amended and expanded on February 26, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2015.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 2015.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2156

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. VALADAO) at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-29) on the resolution (H. Res. 125) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WILSON of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business with POTUS.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 26, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

537. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0253; FRL-9919-59] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

538. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; PSD Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead, 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, and 2010 SO₂ NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0888; EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0969; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0991; EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0435; FRL-9923-48-Region 5] received February 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

539. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Transportation Conformity [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0662; FRL-9923-45-Region 5] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

540. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's

final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0698; FRL-9923-55-Region 4] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

541. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0694; FRL-9923-56-Region 4] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

542. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Direct Final Approval of Other Solid Waste Incineration Units State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0554; FRL-9923-35-Region 5] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

543. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0885; FRL-9917-29-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR34) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

544. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Oklahoma [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0063; FRL-9923-22-Region 6] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

545. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Louisiana [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-1054; FRL-9923-11-Region 6] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

546. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Promulgation of State Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming; Negative Declarations; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0811; FRL-9923-40-Region 8] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

547. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protection System Maintenance Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM14-8-000; Order No.: 803] received February 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

548. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sudanese Sanctions Regulations received February 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

549. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD709) received February 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

550. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) Out Performance Requirements To Support Air Traffic Control (ATC) Service; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29305; Amdt. No.: 91-334] (RIN: 2120-A192) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

551. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Immediately adopted final rule — Removal of Special Federal Aviation Regulation No. 87 — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Territory and Airspace of Ethiopia [Docket No.: FAA-2000-7360; Amdt. No.: 91-335] (RIN: 2120-AK59) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

552. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories (2135-AA36) received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

553. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0146; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-243-AD; Amendment 39-18094; AD 2015-02-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

554. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0750; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-18097; AD 2015-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

555. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0079; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-18085; AD 2015-02-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

556. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0624; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-18072; AD 2015-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received Feb-

ruary 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

557. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0142; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-18093; AD 2015-02-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

558. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Technify Motors GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by Thielert Aircraft Engines GmbH) Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0683; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-18065; AD 2015-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

559. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Type Certificate Currently Held By AgustaWestland S.p.A.) (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0465; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-044-AD; Amendment 39-18089; AD 2015-02-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

560. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0230; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-242-AD; Amendment 39-18070; AD 2015-02-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

561. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0096; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-040-AD; Amendment 39-18077; AD 2015-02-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

562. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam srl Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0876; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-032-AD; Amendment 39-18076; AD 2015-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

563. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0087; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-234-AD; Amendment 39-18098; AD 2015-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

564. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0078; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-18084; AD 2015-02-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursu-

ant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

565. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1088; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-76-AD; Amendment 39-18091; AD 2014-12-11 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

566. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (formerly Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0133; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-066-AD; Amendment 39-18088; AD 2014-22-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-29). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1055. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1056. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1057. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for an exception from infringement for certain component parts of motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1059. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from asking taxpayers questions regarding religious, political, or social beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1060. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to support non-Federal investments in water infrastructure improvements in the Sacramento Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1061. A bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 1062. A bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 1063. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to eliminate tariffs on technological goods providing educational value for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1064. A bill to reinstate year-round Federal Pell Grants under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1065. A bill to require that States receiving Byrne JAG funds to require sensitivity training for law enforcement officers of that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 1066. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to promote the use of adaptive trial designs, Bayesian methods, and other innovative statistical methods in clinical protocols for drugs, biological products, and devices, and with respect to the requirement to conduct post-approval studies and clinical trials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1067. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the temporary expansion of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, to ensure that judges of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims may enroll in the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1068. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a tribal transportation self-governance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1069. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1070. A bill to provide for adequate and equitable educational opportunities for students in State public school systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1071. A bill to amend section 1120A(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assure comparability of opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 1072. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal agencies and programs and to recommend the elimination or realignment of duplicative, wasteful, or outdated functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1073. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to secure critical infrastructure against electromagnetic threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. TAKAI):

H.R. 1074. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to exempt certain flights from increased aviation security service fees; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1075. A bill to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the "Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1076. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

H.R. 1077. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr.

CÁRDENAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1078. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to exempt from sequestration certain user fees of the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 1079. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to States to establish a comprehensive school counseling program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 1080. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in order to limit the penalties to a State that does not meet its maintenance of effort level of funding to a one-time penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 1081. A bill to assist coordination among science, technology, engineering, and mathematics efforts in the States, to strengthen the capacity of elementary schools, middle schools, and secondary schools to prepare students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1082. A bill to strengthen Indian education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1083. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to apply the Medicare restriction on self-referral to State plan requirements under Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1084. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify the criteria for selecting communities to participate in the Small Community Air Service Development Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1085. A bill to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 1086. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1087. A bill to ensure that methods of collecting taxes and fees by private citizens on behalf of State and local jurisdictions are fair and effective and do not discriminate against interstate commerce for wireless telecommunications services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1088. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1089. A bill to help fulfill the Federal mandate to provide higher educational opportunities for Native American Indians; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1090. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1091. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to use negotiated rulemaking to develop a rule about agriculture quarantine inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1092. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the "Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 124. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Res. 126. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to promote Israeli-Palestinian peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H. Res. 127. A resolution recognizing linemen, the profession of linemen, the contributions of these brave men and women who protect public safety, and expressing support for the designation of March 31, 2015, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 1053

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, of the Constitution

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution

Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, of the Constitution

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution which says, "To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 1060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to regulate commerce between the states, and has previously been used to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation, which this bill addresses.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

"Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes."

General Aviation contributes \$150 billion to the U.S. economy and supports 1.2 million jobs. This legislation will both protect the rights of over 400,000 general aviation pilots currently flying and encourage more to participate in this community.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 1063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause, Article 1
Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 1068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power "[t]o regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power "[t]o regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 1072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which states "The Congress shall have Power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 1074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 1077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 18 To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 1078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that "Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare fo the United States

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 1084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 1086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which reads "The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes."

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clauses 1 and 3

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 1088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 1090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3's authority to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 178: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 188: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 197: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 199: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 217: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 231: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 249: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 281: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 284, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 335: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 353: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 354: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 358: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 438: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 451: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 452: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 456: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 461: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 465: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 532: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 546: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 555: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 571: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 583: Mr. FORBES and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 584: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 590: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 594: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 600: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 609: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 620: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 654: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 663: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 674: Mr. BEYER and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 680: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 689: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 699: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 700: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 703: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 704: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 707: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 712: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 716: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 727: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 729: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 732: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 751: Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 756: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 757: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 767: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 774: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 797: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 803: Ms. FOX and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 818: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SIREN, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 823: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 842: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. COLE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 843: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 850: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 855: Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 864: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 867: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 880: Mr. BLUM.
 H.R. 882: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 887: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 894: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 902: Mr. HOYER.
 H.R. 903: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 916: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 918: Mr. COLE, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 919: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VELA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 923: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 924: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 940: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 955: Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 963: Mr. POLIS and Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 975: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 981: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 986: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 988: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 996: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 1004: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1005: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1006: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1009: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1017: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 1021: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 1024: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SABLAN, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1026: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 1031: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIMES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIND, Mr. VELA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HAHN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. WALZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MENG, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BASS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania,

Mr. SIRES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1032: Mr. COOPER.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.J. Res. 33: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HUNTER.
 H. Res. 15: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. NOLAN.
 H. Res. 28: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COOK, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. TAKAI.
 H. Res. 45: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H. Res. 54: Ms. LEE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. COOK.
 H. Res. 93: Mr. PETERS.
 H. Res. 112: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H. Res. 122: Mr. MARINO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative KLINE, or a designee, to H.R. 5, Student Success Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.